GENEALOGY COLLECTION

GEN
ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01749 1017
GENEALOGY
975.2
M365HM
1944

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/marylandhistoric39brow

MARYLAND

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY



VOLUME XXXIX

BALTIMORE

1944

6.8819

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXIX

	PAGE
A Brief Summary of the Maryland Historical Society's Hundred Years. *By Samuel K. Dennis*,	1
The Library Company of Baltimore, 1795-1854. *By Stuart C. Sherman*,	6
A Discordant Chapter in Lincoln's Administration: The Davis-Blair Controversy. *By Reinhard H. Luthin*,	25
Bennet Allen, Fighting Parson, *continued. By Josephine Fisher*,	49
The Historic Mulberry Tree of St. Mary's City. *By William B. Marye*,	73
A List of Promotions in the Maryland Regular Troops, 1776. *Edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr.*,	81
Book Reviews, 85, 164, 269,	345
Notes and Queries, 93, 175, 274,	357
Vignettes of Maryland History: Part I. *By Raphael Semmes*,	95
Letters of Severn Teackle Wallis, 1816-1894. *By Frederick Down Scott, S. J.*,	127
Madame Grelaud's French School. *By Lucy Leigh Bowie*,	141
Politics in Maryland during the Civil War, *continued. By Charles Branch Clark*, 149,	315
An Account of the John Brown Raid,	162
Controversy over the Command at Baltimore in the War of 1812. *By Ralph Robinson*,	177
Civilian Defense in Baltimore, 1814-1815: Minutes of the Committee of Vigilance and Safety. *Edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr.*, 199,	293
One Hundred Years of Electrical Communication in the United States. *By Frank B. Jewett*,	225
A Maryland Tour in 1844: Diary of Isaac Van Bibber,	237
William Pinkney's First Public Service. *By Max P. Allen*,	277
Early Maryland Bookplates *By Edith Rossiter Bevan*,	310
Governor Charles Goldsborough's Views on Slavery,	332
Among the "Meeters at the Bayside." *By Emerson B. Roberts*,	335

ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
Newsboys' Address, 1780, opp.	95
Announcement of a Lottery Broker, 1823,	115
Toll Rates at Norwood's Ferry Bridge, 1817,	123
Eliza Law (Mrs. Lloyd Nicholas Rogers) (1797-1822), opp.	141
Julia Calvert (Mrs. Richard Henry Stuart) (1810 ?-1888), opp.	141
William Henry Winder (1775-1824) by Joseph Wood, opp.	177
Isaac Van Bibber (1810-1847), opp.	237

Volume XXXIX Number 1

39

The Maryland Historical Magazine

1844 1944

MARCH · 1944

A Brief Summary of the Maryland Historical Society's Hundred Years . . *Samuel K. Dennis* 1

The Library Company of Baltimore *Stuart C. Sherman* 6

A Discordant Chapter in Lincoln's Administration: the Davis-Blair Controversy *Reinhard H. Luthin* 25

Bennet Allen, Fighting Parson (*concluded*) *Josephine Fisher* 49

The Historic Mulberry Tree of Saint Mary's City *William B. Marye* 73

A List of Promotions in the Maryland Regular Troops, 1776 . . . . *William D. Hoyt, Jr.* 81

Book Reviews: Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, reviewed by Richard D. Steuart; Weslager, *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, by Raphael Semmes; Lomax, *Leaves from an Old Washington Diary, 1854-1863*, by Penelope W. Jamison; Brown, *Mirror for Americans*, by R. C. Medford, etc. 85

Notes and Queries 93

Published Quarterly by the

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

BALTIMORE

$3.00 the Year Single copy 75 c.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

BOOKBINDING

FRANK W. LINNEMANN
125 W. Mulberry St. • MU 0197
Magazines, medical books, Old books rebound

BOOKS — NEW AND USED: BOUGHT AND SOLD

SMITH'S BOOK STORE 805 NORTH HOWARD STREET
Established 1876

PHOTOGRAPHY

THE HUGHES COMPANY
J. W. Scott
213 West Monument Street, Baltimore

PHOTOSTATS & BLUEPRINTS

Baltimore Photo & Blue Print Co.
HEARST TOWER BUILDING
Photo copying of old records, genealogical charts and family papers. Enlargements. Coats of Arms. LE 6881

PLUMBING — HEATING

M. NELSON BARNES
Established 1909 Vernon 1646 807 N. Howard St.

STATIONERY, PRINTING & ENGRAVING

JOHN H. SAUMENIG & CO. 229 Park Ave. • Baltimore
Lewis R. Curlett Newton R. Haen

The Office of

Tongue, Brooks & Zimmerman

213 Saint Paul Place

Solicit Your

INSURANCE

EXPERIENCE FIRST

In Packing and Moving experience counts more than anything else. This is why *Monumental* is safe and dependable.

Established 62 years ago, *Monumental* can be relied on to handle your possessions with the same care you would use yourself. Let *Monumental* relieve you of the worry and bother. It's the safe way.

Experience counts, too, in cleaning and repairing your rugs, carpets and draperies. Let *Monumental* put its experience to work for you.

MONUMENTAL

STORAGE AND CARPET CLEANING CO.

SPECIAL VAULTS FOR ART OBJECTS AND SILVER: MOVING, PACKING, SHIPPING, FUMIGATING, RUG CLEANING, REPAIRING, LAYING

1110-1116 PARK AVENUE BALTIMORE, MD.

TELEPHONE SARATOGA 3480

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Buildings

201 W. MONUMENT STREET

BALTIMORE

President

George L. Radcliffe

Vice-Presidents

J. Hall Pleasants — Laurence Hall Fowler — J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul

Corresponding Secretary

William B. Marye

Recording Secretary

W. Hall Harris, Jr.

Treasurer

Heyward E. Boyce

Trustees of the Athenaeum

G. Corner Fenhagen, *Chairman*

Howard Baetjer — Thomas F. Cadwalader

Summerfield Baldwin, Jr. — C. Morgan Marshall — Henry Duffy

Committee on the Gallery

John Henry Scarff, *Chairman*

James R. Herbert Boone — H. Irvine Keyser, 2d

Miss Jane James Cook — R. McGill Mackall

Committee on the Library

Louis H. Dielman, *Chairman*

Robert Garrett — Thomas G. Machen

George Harrison — A. Morris Tyson

Charles C. Wallace

Committee on Finance

Charles E. Rieman, *Chairman*

William G. Baker, Jr. — Rodney J. Brooks

Committee on Publications

Raphael Semmes, *Chairman*

Henry D. Harlan — J. Hall Pleasants

Committee on Membership

Mrs. Francis F. Beirne, *Chairman*

George W. Constable — Miss Elizabeth Chew Williams

Ferdinand C. Latrobe — Marshall Winchester

John P. Paca, Jr. — Mrs. Henry Zoller

Committee on Addresses and Literary Entertainment

B. Howell Griswold, Jr., *Chairman*

Richard F. Cleveland — Henry E. Treide

James W. Foster, *Director, and Editor of the Magazine*

The Magazine is entered as second class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under Act of August 24, 1912.

MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXIX MARCH, 1944 No. 1

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY'S HUNDRED YEARS*

By SAMUEL K. DENNIS

It is a pleasure and an honor to participate on any terms in the birthday celebration of this virile and learned centenarian; to tell you briefly of its power, and triumph; to mention also some of the existing weaknesses it will doubtless correct long before its next centennial. Since I am not an officer of the Society I am the better enabled to do both objectively.

Your magnetic and progressive President lately ordered me to deliver an address covering the crowded century this Society has lived. I protested. That would consume hours; would postpone too long the promised opportunity to hear one of the world's fine poets and authors, the Honorable Archibald MacLeish.

Again it is superfluous to rehearse the history of the Society, when the splendid historical address of the late Bernard C. Steiner, carefully prepared and delivered in 1919, is available. A compromise was reached; which is " A Brief Summary "; and you will find that indeed enough.

I would prefer to speak without manuscript. But to do so

* Address before the Centennial Meeting of the Society at the Peabody Institute, February 21, 1944.

involves the danger that I might overrun your patience. A written paper imposes calculated limits; a salutary device.

All know this Society was organized by large and enlightened men, the intellectual elite of the City, at a time when there was direst need of its offices. Its corporate function expressed in its ancient charter was to collect, preserve and diffuse information relating to biography and to the civil and literary history of this State and of America. We are proud of that small group of progressive men, with a blessed sense of the past, such as Mayer, whose portrait adorns the Society's hall, Latrobe, Brune, Lucas, Brown, Donaldson and J. Morrison Harris (the last of the founders to pass away), who sacrificed valiantly and labored fruitfully a century ago to found and nurture this institution.

Perhaps they would feel rewarded for their efforts, their faith confirmed, could they note the growth of this unique Society, now of over 2,000 members, which maintains a considerable museum, an art gallery, and a really great library that includes a fine collection of original historical material, housed in part in a mansion itself nearly a century old. That is not all. The Society publishes a magazine of unquestioned quality; and has happily become patron and host for a popular free lecture program, as is abundantly demonstrated by the presence of our gifted guest speaker of the evening. It is clear the Society is still true to the original ideals of its founders.

We are proud of the vitality of the Society, its drawing power, its quality of continuity. Descendants of the founders are potent today in its affairs. Men and women of the Mayer, Latrobe, Donaldson and Brune blood, for example, are among our members. Perhaps the most signal instance of sustained loyalty to tradition is found in our secretary, Mr. W. Hall Harris, Jr. His grandfather, a great and forceful man, J. Morrison Harris, helped found the Society. He lived to deliver the address when the Society celebrated its fiftieth birthday. Secretary Harris' father, the late W. Hall Harris, suave, intellectual, gifted, was our President for thirteen years. Hence the Society over a period of a century has incurred a debt of gratitude to the Harris family.

For over sixty years the Society had its home in the old Athenaeum Building, at Saratoga and St. Paul Streets, where the garage—what a change—now stands. That dignified old building was not fire proof, was dingy, dark, and ill-suited. It must be

owned the meetings held there were formidable. Minutes and correspondence were read *in extenso* to a mere handful of faithful members present, and late in the evening they were rewarded, or punished, with a " discourse." The streamlined mechanics of a corporate meeting you witnessed tonight are not of the past century. Nor was the Athenaeum a pleasant place to work. Patient, pallid genealogists shuffled in perennial gloom; and the public rarely invaded their semi-solitude.

We were emancipated from those severe quarters February 18, 1919, through the generosity of the greatest of the Society's multitude of benefactors, Mrs. H. Irvine Keyser. She it was who bought the old Enoch Pratt mansion, through which you lately passed; and she it was who added the fire proof structure, passed on its plans, and presented the whole to the Society as a memorial to her husband. It is perhaps in poor taste to mention figures in connection with a memorial so dignified, so august, presented so graciously to honor her husband, and to preserve from fire and moth the historical treasures she so sincerely appreciated. Yet for the record it should be said, I hope without impropriety and if we judge correctly, that the property cost Mrs. Keyser about $200,000. The Society has received countless rich gifts from generous friends; legacies, and works of art, whole libraries, manuscripts, which defy appraisal for they are not to be priced in dollars. Nevertheless the glorious generosity of Mrs. Keyser, according to tangible standards, overtops the rest.

We look back to the fabulous characters who have been our guests or patrons; men of the caliber of Webster, Clay, Peabody, Bulwer Lytton, James Bryce, Clemenceau, and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden. A century hence your descendants will reflect proudly upon the many famous public men who have been attracted to this platform by our indefatigable President, constantly aided by Mr. Benjamin Howell Griswold, Jr., Chairman of the Committee on Addresses. Posterity will envy us the opportunity, which we in fact richly enjoy, of seeing those figures and hearing their living voices.

The Society collected, and, until the Hall of Records was completed, preserved, an immense mass of early public records at a time when the State itself was neither disposed nor able to protect them from theft and loss. The Society's own enormous collections of manuscripts, original corporate and personal records

are of inestimable value to students and antiquarians. The Society has edited and published fifty-nine volumes of State *Archives*, aided by State appropriations, and thereby made the most important provincial records of the State available. It is amazing how constantly the Archives are consulted. Some of those volumes are dog-eared with use. Dr. J. Hall Pleasants merits unstinted praise for lately performing that exacting editorial task.

Perhaps the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, started in 1906, under the editorial care of Professor William Hand Browne, supplies our widest popular appeal. Our members are scattered here, there and even abroad. Relatively few have access to Society headquarters, or may listen to the interesting lectures delivered there by accomplished journalists, statesmen and authors. The *Magazine* reaches them all. It is also available to patrons of many libraries. The magazine continued to find public favor during the golden period when that remarkable man of letters, Louis H. Dielman, was its editor. And now that editorial duty falls to our gifted Director, Mr. James W. Foster.

A further triumph: In 1891 the Society abandoned its original anti-feminist policy and welcomed women to membership. True, no undignified haste marked that step. But the wisdom of the new and enlightened policy has been graciously and beautifully vindicated. Many of our most useful and devoted members and officers are women. I believe that Mrs. Robert F. Brent and Miss Harriet P. Marine were the first women to become officers of the Society. Miss Mary W. Milnor was the first, and Mrs. Annie Leakin Sioussat was the second woman admitted to membership.

The Society has had many vicissitudes, has survived or will survive three devastating wars. The demoralization, turmoil, and local dissensions of the Civil War reduced its life to a flickering flame. Its strength was not much abated by the first world war; we trust the present world struggle will leave it strong to serve the ends of learning and culture. It would seem so. Headed by a succession of scholarly, devoted Presidents, revivified and vigorous, it has developed and grown steadily. Its recent growth has been amazing. Tonight, in spite of the preoccupations due to war, its membership, usefulness and public support break all records; tributes to the enthusiasm and ability of its responsible officers.

The light this Society might spread in the community ought not to be limited, much less concealed. To do so is ungenerous. Our

treasures ought to be shared with and enjoyed by the public, made more easily and hospitably available to the people; for a large element will enjoy them. I have belonged to this Society since 1905 and have yet to see some of its exhibits and rooms. They are locked. I am sure Director Foster will correct that condition when he can. He faces an immediate obstacle, the lack of guards to protect exhibits of hallowed associations, and manuscripts from theft.

Though the Society has gone far, has succeeded beyond the hopes of its founders, much remains unattained.

A large membership is desirable. With slight effort our members might be twice doubled in number. Tons of records lie uncataloged, undigested, because the men and means are lacking. Many valuable papers now stored in garrets, churches and homes should be sought and collected ere they are lost. Mr. J. Alexis Shriver, who sits on the front row, had a genius for discovering and retrieving such hidden material. You who find our rooms on Monument Street inadequate, the chairs hard, will argue the Society sorely needs a comfortable lecture hall; such as we now enjoy as guests of the hospitable Peabody Institute. The original Pratt Mansion is not fire-proof. The Society imperatively needs enlarged fire-proof storage space for its rare and exquisite objects, as well as for books and original documents. It needs additional endowments; it needs, and will always need, additional income, for the requirements of culture are insatiate. We hope the future providentially produces a patron who will follow the noble example of Mrs. Keyser with the gift of those needed facilities. A lady of wisdom and wealth she knew that:

> If thou art rich, thou art poor;
> . . . . . .
> Thou bear'st thy heavy riches but a journey,
> And death unloads thee.

The next century may bring our hearts' desires. Perhaps Senator Radcliffe will see them miraculously established during his career as President; vast and hopeless though that development now appears. We may take courage when we recall the Senator's capacity for miracles, as expressed by a business associate, who said: "George Radcliffe, his methods are odd, you think sometimes he will never come through, but give him time enough, let him do it in his own way and he will move the pyramids from Egypt to Druid Hill Park."

THE LIBRARY COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, 1795-1854

By Stuart C. Sherman

A few days before Christmas in the year 1795, " some Gentlemen in Baltimore Town, impressed with a sense of the benefits resulting from a Public Library, & concerned that there was no Institution of the kind in this Town, drew up some Constitutional outlines of one, which they submitted to several, who they supposed would patronize so Laudable an Institution. In a very few days, fifty-nine persons Subscribed these outlines." [1] So states the earliest record of the Library Company of Baltimore.

Among the prominent merchants and intellectuals who were present at the organization meetings at Bryden's Inn during January were the Right Rev. Dr. John Carroll, cousin of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, later to become the first American Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, and for many years a loyal president of the Library Company; Rev. Patrick Allison, first minister of the Presbyterian Church; Rev. J. G. J. Bend, pastor of St. Paul's Church; [2] Richard Caton, a leading merchant, who later married the daughter of Charles Carroll; Robert Gilmor, founder of the first powder mill in Baltimore, and the first president of the Academy of Sciences; Nicholas Brice, lawyer, and David Harris, military officer and merchant. At these meetings a constitution was " agreed to," the price of a share set at twenty dollars, and every member was required to " annually contribute Four Dollars for every share which he may lawfully possess."

Such were the beginnings of the institution whose founders

[1] Quotations, unless otherwise mentioned in footnotes, are taken from the constitution, by-laws, or minutes of the meetings of the Library Company now in possession of the Maryland Historical Society.

[2] It is pertinent to note the close alliance between books and libraries, and the clergy in this period.

were convinced that the " diffusion of useful knowledge " would augment the " prosperity of the community."

The year 1795 showed Baltimore to be a flourishing seaport. War had broken out in Europe three years previously, and exports from Baltimore, chiefly wheat and tobacco, increased over sevenfold in the decade from 1790 to 1800. This period brought the many social and cultural changes which accompany prosperity. A new theater had been opened by Mr. Hallam in 1794, banks were established to handle the sudden inflow of capital, a medical society and a school of medicine (though unsuccessful) had been founded, many new churches established and others strengthened, and several attempts were made to establish academies for the instruction of youth. Society had grown too large for entertaining in private homes and had erected a building called the "Assembly Rooms."

From the founding of the town of Baltimore in 1729 to its incorporation in 1796 the book needs of the inhabitants were met only in a superficial manner by a few circulating libraries operated by booksellers. Of these libraries Baltimore could boast five in 1796. Recent studies of the estates of Maryland families dating from 1674 reveal that nearly sixty percent of the inventories analyzed contained books, although some contained only a Bible or a Common Prayer Book or both.[3] Many of the colonists owned large collections, but these were chiefly held by doctors, lawyers, clergymen, and successful planters and merchants.

After the Revolution, the expansion of the book trade progressed hand in hand with the developing commercial and industrial activity. Newspapers, almanacs, sermons, government reports and legislative enactments, and original and reprinted works of literary character were the chief productions of the press. In Baltimore by 1800 there were twenty printers and booksellers operating.[4] But the trade had not developed to the extent that libraries and private collectors could depend solely on American publications. England was still a world center and America depended upon her literary output. Philadelphia was, at this time, the chief center of the book trade in America, with New York becoming a close rival.

[3] Joseph T. Wheeler, " Books owned by Marylanders, 1700-1776," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXXV (1940), p. 338.

[4] *The New Baltimore Directory and Annual Register for 1800 and 1801* (Baltimore, 1800).

It is interesting to speculate on the possible origin of the Library Company. There may have been no direct connection between the series of letters which appeared in the "Baltimore Daily Repository" [5] of January and February, 1793, urging the establishment of a circulating library, and the actual founding of the Library Company. However, they may have been read, if not written, by some of the founders, and might have influenced their eventual organization. No clue is given to the identity of "Philonaus," "A Citizen," and "Another Citizen," the signers of the letters. Could some of the founders have been stimulating interest and sizing up a public reaction to their project?

"Philonaus" says on January 29th, "It is a circumstance to be regretted, that a town like this, containing upwards of fifteen thousand inhabitants, does not afford a circulating library; . . . The advantages that would accrue towards the mental accomplishments from an institution of this nature, and the disadvantages arising from the want of one, are too obvious to need a recital." [6] He then proceeds to suggest outlines for the proper running of such a library.

"A Citizen," in reply to "Philonaus" two days later, proposed the "adoption of one similar to that of the Philadelphia Library Company established by Dr. Franklin, many years ago, which from its extensive utility is too notorious to require a particular recital." [7] This writer is more eloquent than his co-planner. He further writes that "The advantages resulting to society from an institution which has for its object the information of the inquisitive, the entertainment of the superficial, and the general improvement of the human mind, must strike the most unlettered observer." [8]

"Is it not therefore astonishing that a town respectable for its number, respectable for its commerce, should have continued so long inattentive to the advancement of science, the belles lettres, and the real ornaments of life?" Since some of the suggestions made in the letters actually appear in the Constitution of the Library Company there is sound reason to believe that one or more of the founders wrote the letters.

[5] This was the "first daily paper successfully printed in Baltimore." It was begun on October 24, 1791. Joseph T. Wheeler, *The Maryland Press, 1777-1790* (Baltimore, 1938), p. 72.

[6] Reprinted in the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XII (1917), pp. 297-302.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*

During January and February of 1796 meetings of the Directors of the Library Company were held nearly every week, for there was much to be done. The Rev. Dr. Carroll was unanimously chosen President and for 20 years ably directed the affairs of the Library. A constitution and by-laws had to be drawn up and adopted " for the orderly managing of the institution," and a " room conveniently situated in a central part of the Town, as a depository for their books " had to be procured.

Notices were inserted in the newspapers informing citizens of the newly-formed library and calling upon " those who have subscribed to pay the price of their shares " so that books could be obtained and the library could be opened " with all possible expedition."

On February 29th the Directors, " having duly considered the ends of the Institution, and at the same time, the very low price at which the most valuable Books may be purchased," it was resolved that a committee be appointed to draw up a catalogue of books for the library. On the book committee, there were three clergymen and a doctor, which is perhaps proof of the trust placed in professional men's knowledge of books. In drawing up the catalogue they were directed to confine their selections to books " in the English language, a small proportion of French books excepted," that " rare books introduced into the Catalogue be few," and " that it consist chiefly of books in general demand " and " of general utility."

Two months later a letter was sent to William Murdock, Esq., of London " requesting his assistance in the purchase of the books." The treasurer, Mr. John Brice, Jr., had previously been directed to invest $1200 in the purchase of a Bill of Exchange which would cover the cost of the Library's first large order.

In September, 1796, a room was obtained, and a Librarian, John Mondesir, chosen. He did not remain long in the employ of the Library Company, however, for six weeks later he offered his resignation (we are not told why) and was succeeded by Mr. Perrigny. The Librarian's salary was set at two hundred dollars a year. According to the By-Laws, he was required to " attend at the Library every day in the week, Sunday excepted, from ten o'clock A. M. to two o'clock P. M., in order to deliver and receive the books of the company." To a subscriber he could deliver " one folio for six weeks; or one quarto for five weeks; or one

octavo, or two duodecimos, or four pamphlets, for two weeks." [9] Non-members (i. e., those who did not own shares) could borrow books by leaving a deposit of double the value of the books. Fines were collected by the Librarian for over-due books. He, furthermore, was required to keep the books in proper condition, to keep a register of books issued, and present a monthly financial statement of money received for hire of books, fines, and forfeitures of shares for non-payment.

In the October 5th issue of *The New World: or, The Morning and Evening Gazette* published by Samuel H. Smith, we are informed that " In addition to our information of Saturday we are able to say that the number of books actually imported for the Baltimore Library exceeds 1,300 volumes of various sizes; and that at least 700 more purchased in American bookstores will speedily be added. It is expected that in ten days the library will be opened for the accommodation of the public." [10]

Another contemporary record tells us that " The Baltimore Library Company opened their library for the use of the members on the evening of October 22nd, at the house of Mr. Williams, Lemon street." [11]

In March, 1797, another order for books to the amount of £300 sterling was forwarded to London.[12] The records do not show what titles were imported and which were bought from American booksellers. The book committee did not completely overlook books published in this country, for the Directors proposed that they look into what "American productions it may be proper to add to those already selected."

During this early period of the Library's existence the Directors were often compelled to move the collection. The reason is not given, but the probable answer is that at the rate at which the collection was growing, more and more space was required. The Treasurer's account-books frequently show entries covering payment for new bookcases to shelve the rapidly expanding collection. In the spring of 1798 a room on the first floor of the Dancing Assembly on Holliday Street was engaged for three years at

[9] Books were classed, and also loaned according to size, i. e., folio, quarto, octavo, duodecimo.

[10] Issue of October 5, 1796.

[11] J. Thomas Scharf, *The Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), p. 278.

[12] This order was received in February, 1798.

$150 a year. This proved to be the home of the Library Company for many years.

In March, 1798, the president was requested to ascertain the price for printing a catalogue of the books belonging to the Library Company. Although there is no copy of the catalogue among the other records of the Library, we know that the project was carried out from an entry in Evans' *American Bibliography*,[13] This was the first printed catalogue of the Library Company, and was issued in 600 copies.

It was not one of the duties of a librarian at that time to select and order books. This was the prime function of the book committee, composed of several Directors of the library. A clear picture is not offered in the Minutes, but from what is recorded it appears that the book committee drew up a list of desired books, perhaps from notices sent out by London and American booksellers.[14] This list, called a catalogue, was then submitted to their London agent. Books may also have been bought from itinerant book peddlars and subscription agents, as, for example, " Parson " Mason Locke Weems.

The Minutes for May, 1798, record the first inventory of the Library as follows:

> The Committee appointed to compare the books in the Library with the catalogue of those which have been from time to time purchased for and given to the Company, and to report the Condition in which the books are;—Report, That upon examination, none appear to be wanting, except *Newton on Curves, Ned Evans*, and *De Retz's Memoirs*. . . . They farther report that the books are, in general, very little worse for the use which has been made of them: that of those which have suffered, fresh American editions have received incomparably the greatest injury.

The system of reserving library books is evidently not a modern one for the Minutes record that " if a person leaves with the Librarian a written application for a book which may have been delivered to another, and does not apply for said book within [a stated number of] days after it shall have been returned; It may then be delivered to the next applicant."

[13] " Catalogue of the books, &c. belonging to the Library Company of Baltimore; with the by-laws of the company, and list of members. Baltimore; Printed by John Hayes, 1797."

[14] The newspapers often printed lists of books imported by American booksellers.

In December, 1798, a committee was appointed to write to the Library Company of Philadelphia as to the advisability of " petitioning Congress to take off the imposts upon books imported for public Libraries and concerning the best mode of making such applications, if it should be thought advisable." Whether or not this proposal was carried through is not recorded.

It seems evident from the tone of the Minutes in the spring of 1799 that the affairs of the Company were progressing favorably. The Library collection now exceeded 3,300 volumes and there was a total membership of 346 subscribers, nearly 100 having been added during the year. Because of this increased membership and greater demand for the use of books, the Library was henceforth to be open from ten A. M. till two P. M. every day of the week, Saturday and Sunday excepted. The Librarian's salary was again increased (to $450) plus an allowance of one hundred dollars for stationery, firewood and a servant. Frequent gifts of books and pamphlets are recorded. An examination of the Treasurer's statement showed receipts amounting to over $2,500 for the current year.

At the annual meeting of the Directors the following April (1800) it was gravely announced that the ship carrying books ordered from London was reported missing. The books were, however, insured and it was expected that the Company could collect £250 insurance. In spite of this loss there was a general feeling of optimism at the meeting. The Minutes read: " The Directors regret the misfortune which has probably happened in the loss or capture of the ship *John Brickwood*; but they still think that they have great reason for congratulating the Company on the rapid progress of their undertaking, and the prosperous state of their affairs."

What were Baltimoreans reading in 1800?[15] An extremely valuable source for this information is found in the circulation registers which are among the existing records of the Library Company of Baltimore. As far as is known, these are the sole existing records of the reading interests of Baltimoreans, except for diaries and letters. Social and cultural historians have, until recently, failed to recognize the value of these library records as an index to the reading of our ancestors. We must, however, recognize that

[15] The ledger used contained borrower's records for the inclusive years 1800 to 1803 so that this is merely an approximate date.

they do not represent a true cross-section of the reading public at that time, since it was only the wealthy who could afford membership in these societies.

The ledgers contain the names of each member of the Library Company listed alphabetically at the top of the page. Below each name appears a list of the books issued to that person by the Librarian. One may also find when the books were borrowed and just when they were returned. From the entries under such names as Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Roger B. Taney, and John Eager Howard in each successive register, one may gain a pretty satisfactory idea of the interests of these men. A revealing study might be made of the influence of the books of the Library Company on future statesmen. It is perhaps significant that Roger B. Taney, later Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court, was a lover of the classics. At about age 45 he read widely in poetry, including *Canterbury Tales*, Burns, Gray, Percivale, Ovid, Coleridge, and enjoyed Gothic mysteries and romances. Among the latter were *The Castle of Otranto* and the novels of Maria Edgeworth. But his more serious reading included Chalmer's *Political Annals*, Sully's *Memoirs*, and lives of Columbus and Lafayette.

On the whole, our ancestors were well-read and were keeping abreast of the times through newspapers and magazines, chiefly English, besides the best books that were available in the Baltimore Library and in local bookstores and circulating libraries. The erroneous idea that they read little but theology, religious tracts and sermons should be dispelled. The printed catalogue of 1809 reveals that the Library Company owned more books on these subjects than on any other, but the reading of such books was not in proportion to the number available. In fact, except for the few clergymen who were members, the percentage of books on religion which the majority read was practically negligible.

The truth is that the early Baltimoreans were not greatly different from ourselves in what they read. Books on law, medicine, agriculture, husbandry, architecture, and other practical subjects were read to aid them in their occupations or professions. They relaxed at home in the evening with a novel by Fielding, Scott, Richardson, or Fanny Burney following the hero and heroine through their "trials and tribulations." *The Romance of the Forrest, Tales of the Castle* and similar Gothic mysteries, and romances with such titles as *Errors of Innocence* and *Exhibitions*

of the Heart were in vogue. But Baltimoreans were not entirely diverted from more solid reading, even though nearly 25 per cent. of all books read was fiction. They kept in touch with the changing world by reading history. Gibbon's *Rome*, Herodotus, Rollin's *Ancient History*, and Hume's England were especially popular. They read lives of Garrick and Dr. Johnson and Plutarch's *Lives*, and were very fond of following the discoveries of new lands as in Cooke's and Bligh's *Voyages* and other books on travel. Such books undoubtedly helped them to become better citizens and to do more ably the tasks that confronted them in an expanding America. The Baltimorean who could not discourse intelligently on the great English authors over the tea-cup or after-dinner wine and cigar in the drawing rooms at Homewood or Mount Clare was considered provincial and unenlightened.

READING BY SUBJECT IN BALTIMORE FOR THE YEAR 1800

Subject	Number of Books Read	Percentage
1. Fiction	384	24.90
2. Biography	253	16.40
3. Literature and Criticism	243	15.76
4. Voyages and Travel	228	14.79
5. History	211	13.68
6. Science and Medicine	100	6.49
7. Theology and Philosophy	95	6.16
8. Law and Government	28	1.82
	1542	100.00

MOST POPULAR NON-FICTION IN BALTIMORE—1800

Titles	Circulation
1. Pope's Works (Iliad, Odyssey, etc.)	14
2. Gibbon's Rome	12
3. Plutarch's Lives	12
4. Johnson's Works	11
5. Men and Manners (Travel in N. Am.)	11
6. Canterbury Tales	10
7. Rollin's Ancient History	9
8. Hume's England	8
9. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia	8
10. Bligh's Voyages	7

Other books which were among the best-read books of the day included Shakespeare, *Cooke's Voyages*, *Boswell's Johnson*, and

Boswell's Tour of the Hebrides, Stedman's American War, Wealth of Nations, Macaulay's History of England, Life of Garrick, and *Rights of Women.*

MOST POPULAR FICTION IN BALTIMORE—1800

	Titles	Circulation
1.	Don Quixote	16
2.	Castle of the Rock	14
3.	Gil Blas	10
4.	Grasville Abbey (Gothic novel)	10
5.	Sir Charles Grandison	9
6.	Exhibitions of the Heart	8
7.	Fielding's works	8
8.	Scott's novels	8
9.	Ned Evans	7
10.	Arabian Nights	6

Other books on this list included *Clarissa Harlowe, Emmeline, Pamela, Humphrey Clinker, Romance of the Forest, Castle of Otranto, Evelina*, and *Peregrine Pickle.*

ANALYSIS OF THE 1809 CATALOGUE OF THE LIBRARY COMPANY

	Subject	Number of Volumes	Percentage
1.	Miscellaneous	466	12.90
2.	Theology	401	11.09
3.	History	350	9.68
4.	Fiction	339	9.37
5.	Law and Politics	318	8.79
6.	Poetry and Plays	308	8.51
7.	Voyages and Travel	275	7.60
8.	Science and Mathematics	263	7.30
9.	Surgery and Medicine	263	7.27
10.	Biography	211	5.83
11.	Belles Lettres	138	3.81
12.	Classics and Antiquities	135	3.73
13.	Agriculture and Domestic Economy	85	2.35
14.	Art and Music	64	1.77
	Total	3616	100.00

In the Annual Report for April 26, 1802, we find the first record of the Library's book selection policy. It reads:

The Directors flatter themselves that the Company will approve the selection of authors, whose works constitute the valuable accession to

their literary treasure. In the making the selection, the Directors were guided by the intention and desire of enriching the Library with those productions which are esteemed most conducive to encourage Religion and Morality, diffuse correct historical information, and advance the cultivation of the sciences and useful arts. But tho' the Directors appropriated to these purposes, the largest portion of the funds within their management, they were not unmindful of employing a competent share of them for gratifying the taste of genius and providing for the entertainment of those readers who seek amusement and instruction in works of a lighter and less durable kind, but made interesting, by their reference to the events and manners of our own times.

This, of course, is a very broad and general statement, designed to include the demands of most readers, and how eloquently phrased it is!

In the annual report of April, 1804, a greater demand for books was noted, the busiest time of the year being from October to June. During that period a daily average of 66 volumes was delivered to readers. A year later the President reported that the library had spent $1,300 during the year for books, and that the total membership was then 404. The price of shares was raised to $35.

At the February meeting, 1807, a suggestion was submitted that " measures be taken to raise funds for purchasing a suitable lot, and erecting a commodious building for the deposit of the Library." This was not the first mention of such a plan, for several years previously a committee had been appointed to look for a suitable lot. Just how active the Directors really were is not clear from the records. However, when the Minutes frequently record that notices were inserted in the *Federal Gazette* stating that many members had not paid their annual contributions, in consequence of which the library was obliged to borrow money from the banks, one can see that the Company was in no position as yet to invest in real estate.

Somewhat later, the Committee on the Library Lot suggested that all members pay an additional annual fee of $2.00 for eight years, that a fund be formed from these payments toward the purchase of a suitable lot, and that the Library Company apply to the General Assembly for permission to establish a lottery to aid the fund. A notice of this was printed in the *Federal Gazette* and *The American.*

In the annual report of April 27, 1807, the following statement appears:

The Directors of the Baltimore Library Company are sorry to report to their constituents, that the ship *Shepherdess* from London to Norfolk, on board of which were the books ordered last spring, was cast away early in the winter. They could have been a valuable accession to the literary treasure already possessed by the Company. However, there is this alleviation of the disappointment, that the books will probably be repurchased and forwarded during the course of the present year without any material injury to the public stock, in consequence of the property being insured . . .

A year later the books lost on the *Shepherdess* had been replaced and another order filled. However, the uncertainty of shipments from London at this time, and previous losses, induced the Directors to " think of other methods of obtaining the annual supplies of the Library." The " present embarrassment of navigation, and the rates of exchange " impelled them to request that the book committee pay particular attention to the purchasing of books published in the United States.

We must keep in mind the condition of the world at this time. Impressments of British subjects from American ships on the high seas were increasing. In December, 1807, Congress passed the Embargo Act which prevented any American ships from clearing for a foreign destination. But conditions soon gave way to the War of 1812. " The terrific impact of the blockade fell with full force upon New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other parts of the Middle States . . . " [16] " The year 1814 was unique in American maritime annals with commerce and shipping movements practically at a dead standstill." [17]

Such far-reaching events could not fail to have their effect on libraries in this country. Decreasing shipments were felt by American booksellers, and, in turn, by the Library Company. By 1809 these conditions had altered the large importation of books and the book committee " found in the possession of the booksellers few works of real merit " which were not already on the Library's shelves.

[16] Robert G. Albion and Jennie B. Pope. *Sea Lanes in Wartime; the American Experience, 1775-1942* (New York, 1942), p. 121.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

For the next few years the growth of the Library was not commensurate with the means for its increase. The annual report of 1812 optimistically states that the " accumulation of funds will furnish more ample means for a rich gratification when the usual intercourse between this and other countries shall be restored, or less exposed to hazard than at present." A year later we were at war with Britain and the Directors had to rely wholly on the output of American printers. But the Non-Importation, Embargo and Non-Intercourse Acts probably acted as a stimulus for an expansion of the American press. Since ink and paper could not be imported from London, printers were forced to rely more and more on their own resources and abilities to supply their needs. Obliged to depend on American printers, the Directors were surprised to learn that the " talents and industry of our own Country afforded facilities greater than was generally foreseen. . . . Many [American editions of European publications] are no wise inferior in typographical excellency, quality of paper, correctness of execution " to the best English editions.

Much eloquence is often to be found in the Annual Reports concerning the value of the collection and its great benefit to society, for example: " The Directors look forward with pleasure to that period when the Antiquary, the Historian, the Astronomer and Geometrician, the Poet and Connoisseur of the fine arts, and in general, the Studious in all useful learning will find whatever may aid, and enlighten them, in their various pursuits." This is obviously aimed at a particular scholarly class of readers and is typical of most subscription libraries of the period. Their collections did not place as much emphasis on the light and popular romance which would appeal more to the tradesmen and clerks, as did the popular circulating libraries which offered for a few pence a week the most popular novels and books of all the accepted authors.

In the spring of 1809 the second Library catalogue was printed, several copies of which are extant. It is alphabetically arranged in 60 classes, and shows a total of 7,231 volumes.

The collection was characteristic of subscription libraries of the period, being more of an academic than a popular one. Theology represented the largest single class, followed by History, Politics, and Fiction, which were about equally represented. There was a rather large collection of books on such practical subjects

as agriculture, husbandry, manufactures, domestic economy, and rural improvement.

There was a fair representation of American classics. A subscriber might find several theological works of Jonathan Edwards, *The Federalist Papers*, John Marshall's *Life of General Washington*, and Franklin's *Autobiography*. One might also find the Holy Bible, printed by Isaiah Thomas of Massachusetts. But the writings of Cotton Mather and Thomas Paine were lacking. Several European works are of interest, among them being an incunabulum, *Dionysii Holicarnasei Originum Sive Antiquitatum Romanorum, Libri XI*, [1480]; Newton *On Optics*; Buffon's *Natural History*; Cook's *Voyage Towards the South Pole and Around the World from 1772-1775*; Boswell's *Life of Johnson*; and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

In January, 1815, Bishop Carroll, who had been one of the most active founders, and an able president for twenty years, submitted his resignation. He was succeeded by Bishop James Kemp. The Librarian also resigned and was later succeeded by Mr. Richard Owen. This latter change was for the better and the new Librarian made several recommendations concerning the reduction of fines, longer terms of loans, and new titles for purchase which were shortly put into effect.

It was in the spring of 1815 that a lot on Calvert Street was purchased by the Company and shortly thereafter it was announced that the Legislature had approved the library's request to hold a lottery for raising $30,000 with which to erect a library. A building committee was appointed and two years later an architect was authorized to draw up plans.

But conditions were not so rosy for the Library Company. After the war, the American market was flooded with products from overseas which had piled up during the war. This influx of cheap goods drove many American manufacturers and mills out of business. Expanding American industry could not compete with cheap goods. Unemployment became widespread, banks failed in 1819, and depression prevailed until 1824.

These were difficult times for a library which depended for support on the financial ability of its members. Dues and annual subscriptions were hard to collect, and thus, only a few additions could be made to the collection. The Library Company at this time was forced to dispose of the lot because it could not keep up its

payments. Although the storm of the decade was weathered, the Library had passed its prime and was not again to attain the success it had enjoyed before the war.

If we pause for a moment to examine the state of the nation at this time we may discover a cause for this declining interest in the library. The period from 1820 to 1840 represented years of tremendous industrial growth in the north, the expansion of the west, and the adjustment of the south to the cotton kingdom.

Turnpikes, canals, railroads, steamboats, factories, banks, and telegraphy were new words to Americans. Inland canals and new highways were competing seriously with Baltimore's access to the west. To offset this, the ingenuity of Baltimore merchants and business men was responsible, in 1828, for establishing the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad—the first American railroad to convey freight and passengers.

Free education was one of the most tangible social gains of the period. In Baltimore four schools were established in 1829. Five years previously the cornerstone of the old Baltimore Atheneum was laid, where for many years public meetings, exhibitions, concerts and lectures on literary and scientific subjects were held for general enlightenment of the citizens. This was probably a part of the lyceum movement which swept the country at this time and served as a most important educational agency.

This period was also the beginning of the flowering of the American spirit in literature. The really great names were to come a little later. For the present, however, the literary and debating societies played an important part in the cultural life of the day. The literary activity of Baltimore in the post-war period centered about the Delphian Club whose purpose was to foster the interest of its members in literary and scientific pursuits. Among the members of this select group of literati were Francis Scott Key; John Neal, poet and dramatist; Samuel Woodworth, author of the "Old Oaken Bucket"; John P. Kennedy, novelist; and John Howard Payne, author of "Home, Sweet Home." [18]

It is said that between 1815 and 1833 "no less than seventy-two new periodicals were announced for publication in Baltimore. Few never got beyond the prospectus stage, and forty-seven did

[18] See article by John E. Uhler, "The Delphian Club," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XX (1925), pp. 305-346.

not survive over twelve months." [19] This gives some indication of the extensive literary activity present at the time, and perhaps offers an additional reason why Poe came to Baltimore in 1831[20]

A study of American library history reveals that progress is greatest during periods of wealth and leisure. With the establishment of such notable institutions as the University of Maryland, the McKim Free School, the Peale Museum, the Maryland Academy of Sciences, the Maryland Institute of Mechanic Arts, lyceums, new theaters, and the circulating libraries of Joseph Robinson and other printers and booksellers who circulated popular books at a small fee, one might expect that the library would also prosper. However, the situation was almost the reverse, and the reason for it seems quite obvious. This was the age of the rise of the common man with the nearly complete absence of class distinction. The Library Company of Baltimore, on the contrary, was not a classless society. It catered to a select group of merchants and intellectuals who could afford to own a share in the company costing fifty dollars, plus an annual contribution of five to ten dollars. The Directors failed to keep their institution in tune with the times by making its services available to the common man with limited income. The trend in library history at this time was toward the complete popularization of books and libraries.

The new need was later recognized with the establishment of the Mercantile Library Association whose purpose it was to provide opportunities for reading and study to young clerks and apprentices. The movement had started by the establishment of similar libraries in Boston and New York, and its success was due to the low fees ($3.00 annually after an initiation fee of $2.00 in Baltimore), the popular nature of the book collections, and memberships within the means of the young men for whom they were intended. The libraries were usually connected with a school which offered classes in arithmetic, bookkeeping, languages, writing, and debating. The lectures and library were open to all who

[19] John C. French, "Poe's Literary Baltimore," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXXII (1937), pp. 101-112.

[20] Several biographers of Edgar Allan Poe have speculated on the possibility of his having used the Baltimore Library Company. Although no proof appears in the library's records, it is apparent that Poe could not have written as he did without recourse to printed works. It is quite possible that Neilson Poe, a cousin, who was a member of the library at this time, was instrumental in securing permission for him to use the collection.

could pay the annual fee, and the movement was of great service to the interests of literature.

During the mid-twenties the Directors were concerned about the harmful effects of reading light novels and cheap romances by the youth of Baltimore. Such books, the Directors said, are the " delight of youth and not unfrequently the charm of old age. The taste for such productions, particularly in the morning of life, we cannot repress. It can only be controlled and directed to some useful end by the choice of the best performances in this walk of literature." An examination of the catalogues of booksellers' circulating libraries of the period reveal such lush titles as *Andronica, or the Fugitive Bride; Coquette; Doubtful Marriage; Effects of the Passions*; and the *Perplexities of Love.* Perhaps there was due cause for their concern!

On the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Library Company, April 23, 1827, the Directors paused to look back and survey their progress. The report speaks of their indebtedness to the founders for the promotion of the institution amidst the uncertain state of the nation. " This library, for its extent may justly be regarded as perhaps the most select of any in this country, and well suited to the really scientific and practical genius of the present day. . . . "

There is also a less pleasant side of the report which decries the falling off of patronage and the apathy in regard to reading in the community. More than half of the membership joined between 1797 and 1800. In 1827 the library consisted of 10,422 volumes which had cost over thirty thousand dollars. But because of the large number of unpaid dues the library was virtually in a state of inactivity.

" For years," President Gilmor reported in 1834, the " affairs of the institution . . . have continued gradually to decline " in spite of continued efforts to revive interest. Membership was below 300 and the revenue of the library down to $1,000 a year. It was even intimated that the books might have to be sold in order to pay the debts of the Company. Five dollars was finally assessed to each share of stock to help pay the debts, and the annual shares were raised to $50.00.

During this year 435 colored plates in five " elephant folio " volumes, the work of John Audubon, the American naturalist and painter, were presented to the library by President Gilmor. This

was probably the most costly and unique work on ornithology ever published, and one of the treasures of the library's collection.

Publication of another supplementary catalog in 1841 revealed that the library contained 12,338 volumes.

In 1845 a letter from Mr. William Rodenwald, one of the Company's directors, was read " proposing a plan for the erection of an edifice to accommodate the Library and the Maryland Historical Society." Evidently much had been done that did not get into the records, for in 1848 the " Baltimore Athenaeum was opened and the edifice inaugurated by the address of Mr. Brantz Mayer, on Monday evening, October 23rd, in the presence of a large and brilliant audience of ladies and gentlemen. . . ." [21] The speaker, whose address was entitled " Commerce, Literature, and Art," paid tribute to the donors, chiefly commercial men of the city, who gave $45,000 for the purchase of the lot and the erection of the building. He spoke of the usefulness of the Library Company as a place " into which the honest and industrious student may freely come, and carefully collate the discordant materials that have been accumulated with commendable industry for future use." [22]

The Mercantile Library Association was granted a permanent lease of the ground floor for its collections and Reading Rooms; the Library Company occupied the second floor; and the Historical Society, with its art gallery, the third floor. Thus, for a time, all of Baltimore's important libraries were housed under one roof.

Members of the Historical Society and the Library Company were entitled to admission to the Reading Rooms and Art Gallery of either society under a cooperative plan. The three societies formed a Council of Government of the Athenaeum consisting of two members from such society empowered to make resolutions with regard to general maintenance such as janitorial service, insurance, fuel, and repairs.

The new building seemed to give a new spurt of life to the Library Company, for we learn that nearly fifty persons subscribed to the free shares which entitled them to use the Reading Rooms at $8.00 per year. In the annual report of 1851 it was stated that for the first time in over twenty years the library was free of debt

[21] J. Thomas Scharf. *The Chronicles of Baltimore*, Baltimore, 1874, pp. 525-526.
[22] " Dedication of the H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Building," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XIV (1919), p. 16.

and had " acquired stronger claims to the attention of its friends as well as to a generous support from the community."

These improved and satisfying conditions were, however, only temporary. On May 15, 1854, the President of the Library Company called an important general meeting of all stockholders, when a resolution was adopted calling for a union of the Library Company with the Maryland Historical Society. The book collections of the Library were turned over to the Historical Society which was to accept members of the Library on the same terms as its own members, maintain a Reading Room, and open the Library for the free reference use of the general public, the latter service existing today.

Thus, the Library Company of Baltimore passed from the local scene. Though it no longer exists as an institution, its influence has been apparent since its dissolution through its book collection, still owned by the Maryland Historical Society. Its contribution to the library history of Baltimore was to offer a useful collection of books and periodicals for the recreation and enlightenment of the people. But its Directors failed to recognize that the subscription library had passed its zenith, and was rapidly being superseded by a more democratic form of library, which ultimately became what we now know as the American free public library.

A DISCORDANT CHAPTER IN LINCOLN'S ADMINISTRATION: THE DAVIS-BLAIR CONTROVERSY

By Reinhard H. Luthin

It is a familiar fact that Abraham Lincoln was beset by countless problems during his service in the White House. Few situations, however, proved so difficult for the War President as the fierce rivalry of Henry Winter Davis and Montgomery Blair, the two most influential Union leaders in Maryland.

Maryland, with its commercial as well as agricultural interests, had been a traditional Whig State during the antebellum years.[1] Essentially conservative and nationally-minded, this "border slave" State had maintained an opposition alike to the abolition-tainted northerners and secession-influenced southerners. When the national Whig party, for long a bulwark against both northern and southern extremism, collapsed in 1854-1855, most Marylanders who opposed the Democrats gave their support to the new "American" or Know-Nothing party. The latter organization, in addition to its anti-Catholic and anti-immigrant doctrines, muffled the slavery issue and preached the necessity of preserving the Union.[2] Most prominent of Maryland "American" leaders was Henry Winter Davis, representative in Congress from the Baltimore district.[3]

[1] Arthur C. Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, D. C., 1913), pp. 2-4, 44, 62, 133.

[2] Laurence F. Schmeckebier, *History of the Know Nothing Party in Maryland* (Baltimore, 1899), p. 69; Benjamin Tuska, "Know-Nothingism in Baltimore, 1854-1860," *The Catholic Historical Review*, New Series, V (July, 1925), 217-251; Harry J. Carman and Reinhard H. Luthin, "Some Aspects of the Know-Nothing Movement Reconsidered," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXXIX (April, 1940), 229.

[3] The only biography of Davis is Bernard C. Steiner, *Life of Henry Winter Davis* (Baltimore, 1916). A more adequate treatment of Davis is badly needed. An uncritical summary of Davis's career is J. Frederick Essary, *Maryland in National Politics From Charles Carroll to Albert C. Ritchie* (Baltimore, 1932), pp. 201-225.

During 1859 Davis, concerned with defeating the hated Democrats and checking secessionist influence, acquired ideas of forming a union of the "Americans" and the Republicans for the Presidential election a year hence.[4] He proclaimed that Maryland's true interests were with the North rather than the South. In January, 1860, he voted for William Pennington, New Jersey Republican, for Speaker of the House of Representatives.[5] The Republicans reciprocated by giving the office of Sergeant-at-Arms to Davis's lieutenant, Henry W. Hoffman, of Cumberland.[6] Davis maintained that in supporting Pennington he was combatting the "disunion" Democratic party.[7] He firmly believed that the Republicans might be induced to vote for the "American" candidate for President in 1860.[8]

But however valiantly Davis might work for an "American" Republican coalition against the Democrats, he was destined to disappointment. For the progress of events—and the Blairs—decreed otherwise.

The Blair family constituted a mighty power in national politics. Few spoke of this Blair or that Blair, for they were usually termed "the Blairs." Francis P. Blair, Sr., had exerted influence in Democratic circles ever since the days when he had been Andrew Jackson's right arm. One of his sons, Francis P., Jr.,—"Frank"—had settled in St. Louis, where he became a strong factor in Missouri politics. Francis P. Blair's other son, Montgomery, lived with him in Maryland, where the elder Blair held forth at his country seat at Silver Spring, on the outskirts of Washington. In 1856 the Blairs had cast their lot with the Republicans.[9]

The senior Blair and his son, Montgomery, believed that the

[4] Davis to Morrill, August 20, 1859, Justin S. Morrill Papers, Library of Congress; *Speeches and Addresses Delivered in the Congress of the United States and on Several Public Occasions by Henry Winter Davis, of Maryland* (New York, 1867), p. 119.

[5] J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1879), III, 346.

[6] *Congressional Globe*, 36th Cong., 1st sess., p. 663; J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland* (Philadelphia, 1882), II, 1400; Indianapolis *Daily State Sentinel*, February 7, 1860.

[7] Steiner, *Henry Winter Davis*, pp. 145, 150-151; Schmeckebier, *op. cit.*, pp. 107, 107 n.

[8] Henry Winter Davis to Hicks, February (?), 1859, in George L. P. Radcliffe, *Governor Thomas H. Hicks of Maryland and the Civil War* (Baltimore, 1901), p. 18.

[9] For a scholarly treatment of the Blairs' extensive political activities, see William E. Smith, *The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics* (New York, 1933), 2 vols.

slavery question could be settled by colonizing freed Negroes in Central America. They were certain that if the South were assured that the Republicans had no idea of white and Negro equality, the states below the Potomac might even join the Republicans in their fight against the Democrats![10] They laid plans to have conservative, slave-holding Maryland represented in the Republican National Convention, scheduled to assemble in Chicago on May 16, 1860. The Maryland Republican party, wrote one Blair ally, was " a concealed one, its sentiments felt by those who hold them as sentiments not safely or wisely to be avowed."[11] Francis P. Blair and Montgomery Blair, aided by loyal followers, called a state Republican convention at Baltimore on April 27 (1860) at Rechabite Hall. Montgomery was selected as chairman. The elder Blair and Judge William L. Marshall were chosen as delegates-at-large to the Republican national conclave at Chicago. A typical Blair plank advocating Negro colonization was approved. Essentially a Blair project, this sparsely attended State convention assured Maryland votes at Chicago for Judge Edward Bates of Missouri, whom the Blairs were backing for the Republican presidential nomination.[12]

At Chicago all three Blairs—Francis P. and his two sons—were early on the scene, endeavoring to secure the nomination of Bates. When Abraham Lincoln was selected as standard-bearer in preference to Bates and others, the Blairs supported the future Emancipator.[13] The elder Blair and Montgomery conducted a fight for Lincoln in Maryland and Frank did the same in Missouri..[14]

Meanwhile, Henry Winter Davis would have no part of " Black " Republicanism. Like most erstwhile "Americans " and others opposed to the Democrats in the border regions, Davis

[10] Montgomery Blair to James R. Doolittle, " 1859," in Walter L. Fleming, " Deportation and Colonization," in *Studies in Southern History and Politics; Inscribed to William A. Dunning* (New York, 1914), p. 10.

[11] William L. Marshall to Montgomery Blair, May 30, 1860, Francis Preston Blair Papers, Library of Congress.

[12] Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860; Matthew P. Andrews, *Tercentenary History of Maryland* (Chicago and Baltimore, 1925), I, 820; Reinhard H. Luthin, " Organizing the Republican Party in the 'Border-Slave' Regions: Edward Bates's Presidential Candidacy in 1860," *The Missouri Historical Reviews*, XXXVIII (January, 1944), 153-154.

[13] William Baringer, *Lincoln's Rise to Power* (Boston, 1937), pp. 204-205, 233, 280, 286-287; Murat Halstead, *Caucuses of 1860* (Columbus, Ohio, 1860), pp. 125-127, 144.

[14] Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 485 ff; Lucy L. Tasher, " The *Missouri Democrat* and the Cilvil War," *The Missouri Historical Review*, XXXI (July, 1937), 402-403.

went into the newly-founded "Constitutional Union" party and supported Senator John Bell, of Tennessee, for President.[15] Lincoln won the presidency but, as expected, he lost Maryland to his southern Democratic opponent, John C. Breckinridge. Lincoln's popular vote in the State was negligible—only 2,294 contrasted with Breckinridge's 42,482, Bell's 41,760 and Stephen A. Douglas's 5,966.[16]

Fierce competition ensued between Davis and Montgomery Blair for a place in Lincoln's Cabinet. The President-elect's staunch Illinois friend, Judge David Davis, was Davis's cousin, and the Judge exerted efforts in behalf of his Maryland kinsman. But the clannish Blairs—the most potent single personal element in the border regions—were determined that Montgomery Blair should be the Maryland member of the Cabinet. Lincoln chose Blair as Postmaster General primarily because he recognized that the Blairs would be invaluable in exerting influence in the pivotal border states. This infuriated Henry Winter Davis. Thus began the unbridled competition between Maryland's two outstanding Unionists.[17]

Immediately upon entering the White House Lincoln was confronted with the Maryland dilemma: A skeleton Republican party controlled by his Postmaster General, calling for recognition; whereas the bulk of the opposition to the Democrats was enrolled in the Constitutional Union party, in which Davis held vast power. The Davis-Blair rivalry, precipitated when Lincoln favored Blair over Davis for his Cabinet, grew more bitter in April, 1861, as the President set about distributing the Federal patronage.[18]

The Davis-led Constitutional Unionists, having supported Bell for President, were fearful lest Lincoln would give to the Blair-dominated Republicans all of the federal offices in the State. Accordingly, when Lincoln, during the days preceding the firing on Fort Sumter, was making up the slate of Maryland appoint-

[15] Steiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-162.

[16] *The Tribune Almanac*, 1861, p. 49; Carl M. Frasure, "Union Sentiment in Maryland, 1859-1861," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXIV (September, 1929), 212 n.

[17] F. P. Blair, Jr., to F. P. Blair, Sr., December 23, 1860, Blair Papers; Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 514-515; Henry C. Whitney, *Lincoln the President* (New York, 1909), p. 15; New York *Herald*, February 26, 1861.

[18] Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 487-489, 501-502, 513-515; Steiner, *op. cit.*, p. 189; Marshall to Montgomery Blair, May 27, 1860, Blair Papers.

ments, the Constitutional Union newspapers sent out a guarded appeal to the President for recognition.[19]

Lincoln realized that it would be unwise to give Blair's Republicans a monopoly of the federal appointments for Maryland. Hopefully, therefore, he suggested that Davis and Blair together arrange a slate. Some of the high offices went to Constitutional Unionists and others to Republicans. For collector of customs of the Port of Baltimore Lincoln agreed to a Constitutional Unionist, Davis's loyal aide, Henry W. Hoffman.[21] For postmaster of Baltimore another Constitutional Unionist, William H. Purnell, was chosen. For naval officer of the Baltimore Custom House Lincoln approved the selection of a Republican associate of Blair and delegate to the Chicago Convention of 1860, Francis S. Corkran.[22] For navy agent the choice was another Blair Republican, William P. Ewing, who had served as an alternate to the Chicago Convention.[23] Still another Republican, Blair's friend Judge Marshall,[24] received the surveyorship of the Port of Baltimore. Constitutional Unionists, on the other hand, filled three jobs as appraisers in the Baltimore Custom House. And a pro-Blair Republican, Washington Bonifant, became United States Marshal for Maryland.[25] When the slate had been filled a Baltimore journal printed it: [26]

Collector—Henry W. Hoffman (Union)
Postmaster—William H. Purnell (Union)
Naval Officer—Francis S. Corkran (Republican)
Navy Agent—Wm. Pinkney Ewing (Republican)
Surveyor—Judge Marshall (Republican)
Appraisers—Messrs. Fred'k Schley, Montague and Meredith (Union)
U. S. Marshal—[Washington] Bonifant (Republican).

[19] Baltimore *Clipper*, April 13, 1861.

[20] Wrote Attorney General Edward Bates to Blair: "I understood at the time that the Maryland appointments were made chiefly on arrangement made by you & Mr. Davis." See Bates to Montgomery Blair, May 4, 1861, Blair Papers.

[21] W. H. Purnell to Montgomery Blair, February 3, 1864, Blair Papers; Scharf, *History of Western Maryland*, II, 1400; *Biographical Directory of the American Congress* (Washington, D. C., 1928), p. 1105.

[22] Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860; F. S. Corkran to Montgomery Blair, December 23, 1863, Blair Papers.

[23] Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860.

[24] *Ibid.*; Marshall to Montgomery Blair, May 5, 27, 1860, Blair Papers.

[25] Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860; Bates to Montgomery Blair, May 4, 1861, Blair Papers.

[26] Baltimore *Clipper*, April 16, 1861. The Baltimore *Sun*, April 16, 1861, mentioned eleven federal appointments made by Lincoln for Maryland, and commented: "Of the whole number but five have acted with the Republican party. The others were prominent members of the 'American' organization."

Similarly, in the two foreign appointments awarded to Maryland Lincoln treated both Unionist factions equally: A Davis follower, James R. Partridge, was made minister-resident to Honduras,[27] while a Blairite, the German-American leader, Dr. George E. Wiss, received the post of consul at Rotterdam.[28]

Even with Lincoln's impartial distribution of the main Baltimore offices, peace did not reign long in Maryland. When Naval Officer Corkran, a Blair man, did not immediately appoint French S. Evans, a Constitutional Unionist, as deputy naval officer, Lincoln took a hand. In April—one month following his inauguration and less than two weeks following his parcelling of the Baltimore patronage—the President rebuked Corkran in a letter: [29]

> I am quite sure you are not aware how much I am disobliged by the refusal to give Mr. F. S. Evans a place in the Custom House. I had no thought that the men to whom I gave the higher offices would be so ready to disoblige me. I still wish you would give Mr. Evans the place of Deputy Naval Officer.

Lincoln referred this matter to Secretary of the Treasury Salmon P. Chase: "I have been greatly—I may say grievously—disappointed and disobliged by Mr. Corkran's refusal to make Mr. Evans deputy naval officer as I requested him to do." [30] It is significant that Evans became Corkran's deputy.

But it was Davis and Blair themselves who precipitated much of the friction. Maryland seems not to have been large enough to hold both the Baltimore Congressman and the Postmaster General. The State was hardly over the dangers of secession when the feud between the two broke out again, if indeed it was ever silenced.

Soon after the attack on Fort Sumter and consequent outbreak of the War, Davis became a frequent White House visitor and succeeded in cultivating closer relations with Lincoln, largely because of his intimacy with Governor Thomas H. Hicks, who had responded to the President's call for volunteers.[31] Davis per-

[27] Baltimore *Sun*, April 24, 25, 1861; *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (New York, 1897), VII, 519.

[28] *U. S. Official Register*, 1861, p. 5: Dieter Cunz, "The Maryland Germans in the Civil War," *Maryland Historicaal Magazine*, XXXVI (December, 1941), 407-409; Baltimore *Sun*, April 27, 1860.

[29] Paul M. Angle (ed.) *New Letters and Papers of Lincoln* (Boston and New York, 1930), pp. 271-272.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

[31] Baltimore *Sun*, April 24, 25, 1861.

suaded Lincoln to place more federal patronage under his control, on the plea that he needed aid in his campaign for re-election to Congress,[32] and in this Montgomery Blair reluctantly acquiesced. Davis ran for Congress and was defeated.[33] The rivalry for control of Maryland was further intensified by Secretary of the Treasury Chase.[34] Blair wanted a certain employee removed from a Treasury job in Baltimore and his own man put in. Chase refused to agree and began co-operating with Davis. Incensed at the power wielded by his rival, the Postmaster General complained to Lincoln: [35]

> I am struggling to make a party in the State of Maryland for the Administration on the basis of your Messages. Mr. Chase opposed the appointment of the names I submitted to you for the State & the bulk of them were finally given to Mr. Winter Davis's friends with my consent because I could not get those I preferred. Davis did not keep faith with me as to the management of the matter & instead of allowing the smaller offices to go to new & obnoxious men as I would have done he gave them to the most obnoxious plugs in Baltimore to a considerable extent. They were to get [him] the nomination for Congress. It secured that & also his defeat before the people. I have found him impracticable & selfish & not likely to be of much service in the organization for this reason.

Blair's intention to form a party in his State on the basis of Lincoln's " Messages " was in reference to the question of Negro emancipation. The election of Augustus W. Bradford as Governor of Maryland in November, 1861, by the Union elements definitely ended the threat of secession in Maryland. The Unionists were henceforth to fight among themselves over the policy of emancipation for the next several years.

Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation of September 22, 1862, which did not affect the status of slaves in the loyal border states, stirred anew the struggle between the Maryland factions.[36] The Blair party—now called the " conservatives "—became known as the Conditional Union Party, favoring a gradual policy of emancipation with compensation to the slaveholder; in its ranks, besides

[32] New York *Herald*, June 21, 1861.

[33] Steiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 194-196; Baltimore *Clipper*, June 14, 1861.

[34] Montgomery Blair to the President, undated, (copy), Blair Papers. In box marked " 1864."

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] Charles H. McCarthy, *Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction* (New York, 1901), p. 384; William Starr Myers, *The Maryland Constitution of 1864* (Baltimore, 1901), p. 14.

Blair, were Postmaster Purnell and Mayor Thomas Swann, of Baltimore. The Davis party—now called the " radicals "—advocated immediate emancipation; its leaders, in addition to Davis, were Collector Henry W. Hoffman, of Baltimore, and Congressman John A. J. Creswell, of Elkton.[37] Paradoxically enough, Davis and Blair had, by 1863, shifted positions since the beginning of the War insofar as the terms " radical " and " conservative " were applicable. Davis, who in 1860 had little if any interest in the slavery issue and had supported the conciliatory John Bell for President, now became classified as a " radical " because he stood for immediate emancipation of the slaves. Blair, who for several years had been concerned over the Negro question and had worked for the anti-slavery candidacy of Lincoln in 1860, was henceforth regarded as a " conservative " because he opposed immediate emancipation. In 1863 Blair's friend, Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles, expressed it: [38]

> The Blairs were all early emancipationists though southern men. Frank took the bull by the horns in Missouri and Montgomery and his father here [in Washington] and in Maryland. They broke the ice—they fought the battle for ten years at least before those who now claim to be stronger emancipationists than the Blairs. Winter Davis was a Know Nothing and opposing Blair only a short time ago. But Davis now claims to go farther than Blair.

Intertwined with the emancipation issue in brewing more bad blood between the Davis and Blair factions was the jealousy aroused among the Blairs because Lincoln, striving for harmony in the party, permitted Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton and Secretary of the Treasury Chase to award much of the patronage of their respective departments to Davis and the " radicals." Both Stanton and Chase were radicals on the emancipation question and personal enemies of Montgomery Blair and Blair's friend Gideon Welles. The provost-marshals assigned to Maryland by the War Department owed their positions to the Davis group; and Davis himself, having subsequently succeeded in being elected

[37] H. Winter Davis to Creswell, December 20, 1863, March 15, 1865, John A. J. Creswell Papers, Library of Congress; *A Biographical Sketch of Hon. A. Leo Knott With a Relation of Some Political Transactions in Maryland, 1861-1867* (Baltimore, n. d.), pp. 36-37; Myers, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9, 12-15.

[38] Welles to his son, February 24, 1864, Gideon Welles Papers, Library of Congress. See also H. Winter Davis to Wade, June 21, 1864, Benjamin F. Wade Papers, Library of Congress.

to Congress again in 1863, paid more than one visit to Lincoln in behalf of his friends among the provost-marshals.[39] Chase readily allowed the Baltimore Custom House, under his jurisdiction, to be used to sustain the Davis faction rather than the Blair following.[40]

As if to disrupt further the relations between the followers of Davis and Blair, Naval Officer Corkran—who had meanwhile deserted the Blairs to align himself with Davis—co-operated with Chase in having a pro-Blair office-holder, Internal Revenue Collector James L. Ridgely of the Second Maryland District, removed and a Davisite, Joseph J. Stewart, appointed in his place. Montgomery Blair was furious. The fight assumed major proportions, and committee after committee from both the Davis and Blair factions waited on the President, seeking justice. Blair endeavored to persuade Lincoln to remove Stewart and re-appoint Ridgely.[41] In anger the Postmaster General wrote Corkran, quoting Lincoln as saying to him (Blair):[42]

> My friend Corkran has got me into a scrape. He got me to sign a paper appointing a friend of his to office and removing Mr. Ridgely, a friend of Col. Webster's [a Blair follower], a fast friend of the administration then in the field fighting the enemies of his country. I do not wish to remove Mr. Stewart for he has been a faithful officer but I am satisfied I have done injustice to Mr. Ridgely. I have been looking around for something for Mr. Stewart, but as yet nothing has turned up. Time flies and Mr. Ridgely's friends are sore, can you not induce Mr. Stewart to resign?

In the showdown with Lincoln, Secretary Chase defended Stewart's appointment.[43] The President allowed Stewart to remain in office, and the Senate confirmed him.[44]

Between Stanton and Chase, life for Montgomery Blair became miserable. Dejectedly the Postmaster General wrote an associate:[45]

[39] George M. Russum to Creswell, February 26, 1864; John Frazier, Jr., to Creswell, November 20, 28, 1863, Creswell Papers.

[40] Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 255.

[41] F. S. Corkran to Chase, December 21, 1863, April 21, 1864; Joseph J. Stewart to Chase, February 3, 1864, Salmon P. Chase Papers, Library of Congress; *U. S. Senate Executive Journal* (1862-1864), XIII, 15, 387.

[42] Statement of Montgomery Blair to Corkran, as quoted in Joseph J. Stewart to Chase, February 3, 1864, Chase Papers.

[43] Corkran to Chase, April 21, 1864, Chase Papers.

[44] *U. S. Senate Executive Journal* (1862-1864), XIII, 498.

[45] Montgomery Blair to Edward L. Thomas, (copy), "confidential," July 14, 1864, Blair Papers. For Chase's and the radicals' support to Stanton for the War

The Provost Marshals and their Deputies aided by the Custom House employees carry the primary elections in parts of the county [of Baltimore] easily—nobody but themselves attending. Mr. Stanton's advisers for Md. are known to be Judge Bond and Mr. Henry Winter Davis, who are equally confiided in . . . [as are] the protegees of the late Secy of the Treasury [Chase]; so that we have the Purse & the Sword of the Nation against us in Md. in our efforts to sustain the President.

The feud between the two Maryland groups over the questions of patronage and Negro emancipation continued with bitter intensity. In the November, 1863, state election for comptroller and members of the Legislature the Davisites triumphed on the issue of immediate emancipation as opposed to Blair's plan for gradual, " compensated " emancipation. Lincoln declined to interfere in the state contest.[46] The Blairites, considerably weakened, continued the fight. In January, 1864, the Postmaster General, in company with his now ally, United States Senator Thomas H. Hicks,[47] addressed the Legislature at Annapolis, alleging that Lincoln was favorable to their plan of Negro emancipation. This only inflamed Davis and his followers the more.[48]

The approach of the Presidential campaign of 1864 opened even wider the rift among the Maryland Unionists. Davis's forces, led by Congressman Creswell and Collector Hoffman, secured control of the Union state convention held on Februaary 22 to select delegates to the National Convention. The Postmaster General's father, old Francis P. Blair, and the Blair associate, Postmaster William H. Purnell of Baltimore, were defeated for delegate-at-large. The four delegates-at-large chosen were Creswell, Hoffman and two other Davis followers. Moreover, after a stormy session, the convention adopted a resolution declaring for " immediate " emancipation, over the Blairs' opposition.[49]

Flushed by success, the Davis forces set out to win victory for immediate, unconditional emancipation and to destroy the last vestige of the Blair influence in Maryland. They enlisted Lincoln's support. One Davisite wrote another: [50]

portfolio in 1862 and for the Blairs' hatred of Chase, see T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and the Radicals* (Madison, Wis., 1941), pp. 89-90, 297-298.

[46] *Biographical Sketch of Hon. A. Leo Knott* . . . , pp. 37-38.

[47] By late 1862 Hicks, formerly friendly to Davis, was inclined to favor the conservation, or Blair faction of the Union party. See Radcliffe, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

[48] Hugh L. Bond to Creswell, January 19, 1864; George Earle to Creswell, January 18, 28, 1864, Creswell Papers.

[49] Baltimore *Clipper*, February 23, 1864; Earle to Creswell, February 24, 1864, Creswell Papers.

[50] R. H. Jackson to Bond, April 18, 1864, Creswell Papers.

673919

I would suggest that President Lincoln certainly ought to know that Blairism is a mere myth in this State. Please impress this upon his attention if necessary. There are, as we all know, but two political parties in this State, viz: the Unconditional emancipationist, and the so-called States Rights [Democratic] party. Conditional emancipation or apprenticeships meet with but little favor anywhere in Maryland. The masses are either in favor of retaining negro slavery as it now is, or for its immediate, unconditional abolishment.

Neither Mr. Blair or (*sic*) the P. O. Department of this State have *legitimately* anything to do with the Custom Office of this Port. . . . Please draw heavily upon the President. We must be sustained or go to the wall.

Meanwhile, in Washington Davis as member of Congress was stirring a hornet's nest within the Republican party. He opened unrestricted warfare upon the President's plan to restore the conquered Confederate States to their former places in the Union. The historian of Lincoln's reconstruction policy concludes that Davis's opposition to Lincoln was based on two grounds: chagrin at his being passed over in 1861 for a Cabinet seat in favor of Blair; and a conviction that Lincoln's "Presidential" plan of reconstruction was unwise.[51]

Lincoln took the view that reconstruction of the defeated States of the Confederacy was a Presidential—not a Congressional—function to be performed through the encouragement of a loyal minority within those states and by the initial agency of those provisional governments which operated under executive control during the War in occupied portions of the South. In his Proclamation of December 8, 1863, the President offered pardon, with certain exceptions, to any adherents of the Confederacy who would take an oath to support "the Constitution of the United States and the Union of the States thereunder." Whenever in any State a loyal nucleus equal to one-tenth of the votes cast in the Presidential election of 1860 should qualify by such oath-taking and establish a State government with abolition of slavery, Lincoln promised executive recognition of such government.[52]

Davis, encouraged by his radical colleagues in Congress, sponsored in the House of Representatives a reconstruction measure as an alternative to Lincoln's plan. Identical legislation was intro-

[51] McCarthy, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

[52] James G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston and New York, 1937), p. 699.

duced in the Senate by Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio. By July, 1864, as Lincoln's campaign for re-election to the Presidency opened, the Wade-Davis bill had passed both houses of Congress. It was a drastic measure which made restoration difficult by intrusting the reconstruction of a State not to a minority ready for future loyalty, but to a majority whose Unionism was a matter of past conduct. Under authority of the provisional government an enrollment of white male citizens was to be made. If the persons taking oath to support the Constitution of the United States should amount to a majority of those enrolled, the loyal people were to be invited to choose a constitutional convention for the launching of a new State government; but no one who had held office, State or Confederate, " under the rebel usurpation," or had voluntarily borne arms against the United States, should be permitted to vote or serve as delegate at such election. In the new governments to be set up slavery was to be prohibited, the " rebel " debt was to be repudiated, and no office-holder under the " usurping power " (with minor exceptions) should " vote for or be a member of the legislature or governor." There can be little doubt that Davis's and Wade's bill was full of vindictive severity and would have perpetuated war-time bitterness. By a pocket-veto Lincoln prevented the radical measure from becoming law.[53] Wade and Davis replied to Lincoln by a public appeal—the celebrated Wade-Davis Manifesto, the most severe attack ever made upon Lincoln within his own party.[54]

The ever-widening split between Lincoln and the Wade-Davis faction of radical Republican-Unionists, added to the then poor showing of the Union armies, bade fair to result in the President's defeat for re-election. His campaign managers were frankly alarmed.[55] And Lincoln himself was pessimistic about his chances to win in November over his Democratic opponent, General George B. McClellan.[56] As if to add to the Lincolnites' worries, the more irreconcilable radicals in his party had nominated Gen-

[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 699-700; Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 318-319; Allan Nevins, " Lincoln's Plans For Reunion," *Abraham Lincoln Association Papers* (Springfield, Ill., 1931), 1930, pp. 69-72.

[54] John K. Hosmer, *Outcome of the Civil War, 1863-1865* (New York and London, 1907), pp. 139-143.

[55] Henry J. Raymond to Cameron, August 19, 21, 1864, Simon Cameron Papers, Library of Congress.

[56] Memorandum, August 23, 1864, printed in John G. Nicolay and John Hay (ed.) *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1894), X, 203-204.

eral John C. Frémont, the famed "Pathfinder," as an independent candidate for President.[57] These circumstances placed Davis and his fellow-radicals in a most strategic position in their fight against Lincoln—or, perhaps, in their struggle with the potent conservative influence in the Cabinet, Montgomery Blair.

Scarcely less bitter than Davis against the Blairs was General John C. Frémont. For Frank Blair had been the spearhead in the successful effort to induce Lincoln to depose Frémont as commander of the Department of the West back in 1861, when Missouri became too small to hold both the Pathfinder and himself. At that time Lincoln had sent Montgomery Blair to St. Louis to investigate Frémont's military administration, and the Postmaster General had returned to Washington with a report highly unfavorable to Frémont. Then the President had removed Frémont from his command. There was small wonder that bad blood existed between the Pathfinder and the Blairs.[58]

With the three most conspicuous radical Republicans—Frémont, Wade, and Davis—having a common hostility toward Montgomery Blair, Senator Zachariah Chandler of Michigan (himself a radical who had become fearful lest Frémont's independent candidacy endanger Lincoln's re-election and bring into the White House the hated "Copperhead" Democrat, General McClellan) reluctantly concluded to restore harmony within the Republican-Union ranks. Chandler endeavored to persuade Frémont to withdraw from the Presidential race. First he journeyed to the home in Ohio of Senator Wade, who agreed to support Lincoln for re-election if the President would remove Blair from the Cabinet. On his return East, the Michigan senator obtained similar assurances from other radical leaders on condition that Blair be ousted. At the White House Chandler is said to have extracted from Lincoln a promise to remove Blair if Frémont would withdraw from the campaign. There is some evidence that the President gave this assurance, although most reluctantly. Then Chandler visited Davis in Baltimore. Davis agreed to back Lincoln for re-election if Blair left the Cabinet. Finally, the Michigan senator went to New York, where after strenuous arguments, he

[57] Allan Nevins, *Frémont: Pathmarker of the West* (New York, 1939), pp. 568-574.

[58] *Ibid.*, Chapters XXX, XXXI; William E. Smith, "The Blairs and Frémont," *The Missouri Historical Review*, XXIII (January, 1929), 214-260.

finally persuaded Frémont to withdraw from the Presidential contest, in return for Lincoln's sacrifice of Blair. Frémont's letter of withdrawal was published on September 22.[59] On the next day, the 23rd, the Chief Executive requested Blair to send in his resignation as Postmaster General: [60]

Executive Mansion,

Washington, September 23, 1864.

Hon. Montgomery Blair.

My Dear Sir:—You have generously said to me, more than once, that whenever your resignation could be a relief to me, it was at my disposal. The time has come. You very well know that this proceeds from no dissatisfaction of mine with you personally or officially. Your uniform kindness has been unsurpassed by that of any other friend, and while it is true that the war does not so greatly add to the difficulties of your department as to those of some others, it is yet much to say, as I most truly can, that in the three years and a half during which you have administered the General Post-Office, I remember no single complaint against you in connection therewith.

Yours, as ever,

A. Lincoln.

Blair in reply sent Lincoln his letter of resignation as Postmaster General of the United States.[61] Davis and his radical associates had done much to eliminate Blair from the Presidential inner council.

Peace did not come to Maryland, nor to Lincoln, with Blair's retirement from the Cabinet. Following the President's re-election over General McClellan in November, Blair visited the White House. Lincoln's assistant secretary, John Hay, left the written record:

November 9, 1864. . . . Montgomery Blair came in this morning. He . . . is very bitter against the Davis clique (what's left of it), and fool-

[59] This account is based on: Winfred A. Harbison, "Zachariah Chandler's Part in the Reelection of Abraham Lincoln," *The Missippi Valley Historical Review*, XXII (September, 1935), 267-276; Letter of Charles Moore in "Zachariah Chandler in Lincoln's Second Campaign," *The Century Magazine*, New Series, XXVIII (July, 1895), 476-477; Walter Buell, "Zachariah Chandler," *Magazine of Western History* (1886), IV, 437-438; Charles R. Wilson, "New Light on the Lincoln-Blair-Frémont 'Bargain' of 1864," *American Historical Review*, XLII (October, 1936), 71-78; *Private and Official Correspondence of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler During the Period of the Civil War* (Norwood, Mass., 1917), V, 168.

[60] Lincoln to Montgomery Blair, September 23, 1864, in Henry J. Raymond, *The Life and Public Services of Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1865), p. 602.

[61] Reply of Blair, printed in *ibid.*

ishly, I think, confounds the War Department and the Treasury as parties to the Winter Davis conspiracy against the President.[62]

Blair was indeed furious at Salmon P. Chase, who as Secretary of the Treasury had favored the Davis faction. During the late campaign Chase had resigned the Treasury portfolio and was now, in November, being prominently mentioned to fill the vacant position of Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Blair himself longed to be Chief Justice. His father, Francis P. Blair, nurtured a burning ambition to see his son wearing this most coveted of American judicial robes. The elder Blair had already written Lincoln: "I think Montgomery's unswerving support of your administration in all its aspects coupled with his unfaltering attachment to you personally fits him to be your representative man at the head of that Bench." [63] The devoted father also enlisted the aid of the Pennsylvania boss, Simon Cameron, in behalf of his son.[64]

The pressure on Lincoln to select Chase as Chief Justice was intense.[65] Much of the support for the former Treasury head came from radical Republican members of the Senate.[66] But Montgomery felt certain that he could outdistance Chase and rallied around him powerful conservative foes of Chase.[67] His efforts, however, were in vain. Lincoln had long made up his mind to appoint Chase, and on December 6 sent the latter's nomination as Chief Justice to the Senate for confirmation.[68] And Blair's friend and former colleague, Secretary of the Navy Welles, believed that Chase's appointment was satisfactory only to Senator Charles Sumner and other radicals.[69]

It was to Welles that Montgomery Blair went for consolation and council in his disappointment. Of the visit the Navy chief noted at the time:[70]

December 10, Saturday: Blair called on me in somewhat of a disturbed state of mind and wanted my advice. He had had one interview with the

---

[62] Tyler Dennett (ed.), *Lincoln and the Civil War in the Letters and Diaries of John Hay* (New York, 1938), p. 236.
[63] Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 299.
[64] F. P. Blair to Cameron, November 24, 1864, Cameron Papers.
[65] G. Volney Dorsey to Lincoln, (copy), October 26, 1864, Chase Papers.
[66] Albert B. Hart, *Salmon Portland Chase* (Boston, 1899), p. 321.
[67] Charles Warren, *The Supreme Court in United States History* (Boston, 1935), II, 402 n.
[68] *U. S. Senate Executive Journal* (1864-1866), Vol. XIV, Part I, p. 1.
[69] *Diary of Gideon Welles* (Boston and New York, 1902), II, 196.
[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 195-196.

President since I last saw him, in which the President said he disliked to remove Hoffman from the collectorship of Baltimore, but that the Spanish mission would be vacant and he placed that at Blair's disposal to arrange with Senator Hicks and Hoffman, as he pleased. Blair replied that he could go into no such arrangement. . . .

The appointment of Chase has brought the Maryland malcontents into position. . . . Blair fears the President is flinching and will succumb, and thought it advisable that he, or some one, should have an explicit conversation with the President, and wanted my advice. I told him that it seemed to me very important that such a conversation should take place, but no one could do this so well as himself. . . . Blair . . . said he would see the President, and would boldly and frankly express himself. Blair's present view is to go to the Senate, in place of Governor Hicks, who wishes to be made collector of Baltimore. Of course Hoffman, the present collector, must be removed as the initiatory step to this end.

Blair's plan, in which Welles acquiesced, was thus to have Davis's loyal ally, Henry W. Hoffman, ousted from the Baltimore collectorship, have Hicks resign his Senate seat and be appointed to the collectorship, and have himself sent to the United States Senate in Hicks's place.[71] But Lincoln was reluctant to remove Hoffman lest he estrange further the Davis radicals, whom he still hoped to conciliate.[72] The President, striving for harmony, now offered Blair the post of Minister to Spain. But the former Postmaster General declined this.[73] He declared that he had refused the Madrid mission when he was a young man during the Polk administration.[47]

When Welles gave Blair his moral support he felt himself fully justified. For the Navy head was himself involved in a controversy with Henry Winter Davis. Welles had disliked Davis ever since the beginning of the administration and believed that the radical Maryland congressman was disgruntled because he had not received the Navy portfolio. Welles even requested the Speaker of the House of Representatives not to give the Marylander a place on the House Naval Affairs Committee.[75] The Secretary of

[71] " It is understood that Governor Hicks is to resign his seat in the Senate and be appointed Collector of Customs at Baltimore, in the place of Hoffman, one of the Davisites, and that Montgomery Blair is to have the Senatorship thus vacated "— so wrote a Washington correspondent. See New York *Herald*, December 31, 1864.

[73] See Blair's complaint concerning Lincoln's treatment of him in Dennett, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-244.

[73] Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 331.

[74] Edward L. Pierce, *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner* (Boston, 1893), IV, 255.

[75] *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 482.

the Navy had become a friendly co-operator with the Blairs and often had their relatives and friends appointed to offices in his department. Montgomery Blair's brother-in-law, the able Gustavus V. Fox, was chosen by Lincoln as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Another of the Blair clan in Welles's department was Admiral S. Phillips Lee, who was a son-in-law of Francis P. Blair, Sr.[76] The Blairs' opponents were highly critical of this influence in the Navy Department, one critic complaining editorially: [77]

The Blair Family and the Navy Department—Old Blair and young Blair, Postmaster Blair and General Blair, all the small Blairs and all the little Blairs, all the sons-in-law and all the brothers-in-law of the Blairs, have their broad hands and broad feet upon the Navy Department. . . . The Blair family . . . keeps the fossilized stick, Gideon Welles, in office; it gives the sly fox, who is a relative of the family, control of naval matters; it foists upon the navy such imbeciles as Admiral Lee, who is another relative of the family.

We have no objection to Postmaster Blair's administration of the Post Office Department; but we do emphatically object to his attempt to manage the Navy Department for family purposes. In Welles he has a pliant tool; for Welles is too far gone to do anything except what the Blairs tell him.

Welles, largely because he was closely associated with the Blairs and disliked Davis, was drawn into a fierce fight with Davis and his radical associates. The feud between the Secretary of the Navy and Davis reached its most bitter stage following the ill-starred naval expedition against Charleston in 1863.

Welles and Fox became enthusiastic over the potential offensive powers of the new iron-clad warships. The capture of Charleston, strongly defended by Fort Sumter, appeared feasible, and a fleet of monitors under Rear Admiral Samuel F. Du Pont was commissioned to capture the South Carolina metropolis. With less faith in the new vessels than Welles and Fox, Du Pont was of opinion that they were deficient in " aggression or destructiveness as against forts; " that in order to secure success in such operations troops were necessary. In early April (1863) Du Pont attacked the defenses of Charleston. He met a severe defeat by the Confederates—one of the worst reverses suffered by the Union

[76] Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 2-3, 11; Charles O. Paullin, " President Lincoln and the Navy," *The American Historical Review*, XIV (January, 1909), 290. For Fox, see Claude M. Fuess's article in *Dictionary of American Biography*. For Lee, see *ibid.*, XI, 129-130.

[77] New York *Herald*, June 30, 1864.

Navy. Soon Du Pont opened an acrimonious correspondence with Welles. The Admiral believed that the Secretary of the Navy was attempting to shift to him the blame that should fall upon the Navy Department. The controversy found its way into Congress.[78]

Davis, a personal friend of Du Pont,[79] saw his chance to attack the Blair influence in the Navy Department and defend Du Pont on February 25, 1864, when the Naval Appropriation Bill came up in the House for consideration. The Maryland congressman assailed the management of the Department and asked an investigation while he eulogized Du Pont. Referring to the attack on Charleston as "insane," he hurled an oratorical bomb at Blair's brother-in-law, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Fox: "If there is shame, it is because the department thought a cotton-spinner was better than an admiral to plan it." Davis was answered by Frank Blair, now a member of Congress from Missouri, who told him that, while he was starting investigations of the Navy Department, he opposed all inquiries into the Treasury, then headed by the radical Chase.[80]

Throughout 1864 the fight between the Blairs and Davis—the struggle between conservatives and radicals, and the rivalry for control of Maryland—continued. Now the Navy Department was the center of controversy. Toward the end of the year Davis joined hands with Senator John P. Hale of New Hampshire, Chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, in sniping at the Lincoln administration and badgering the Navy Department, the Blairs' last vestige of influence since Montgomery's resignation from the Postmaster Generalship. Hale, in a sour mood since 1861 when Lincoln selected Welles instead of himself as the New England member of the Cabinet, freshened his quarrel with the Navy Department at every opportunity. Moreover, the New Hampshire senator nurtured an intense dislike of Fox, whom he accused of "spying" on him when he tried to obtain naval contracts for his constituents. Fox held similar sentiments of ill

[78] See Dr. Charles O. Paullin's account of the naval engagement in *Dictionary of American Biography*, V, 532. There are some details in Henry A. Du Pont, *Rear-Admiral Samuel Francis Du Pont, United States Navy: A Biography* (New York, 1926) and in H. W. Wilson, *Ironclads in Action* (Boston, 1898), I, 90-105.

[79] Du Pont to Henry Winter Davis, November 6, 1861, in *Army and Navy Journal* (May 30, 1914), Vol. 51, p. 1237; *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 482; New York *Herald*, November 25, 1864.

[80] *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 531.

will toward Hale.[81] Following Lincoln's re-election in November, Fox complained about Davis and Hale—" two fellows that have been especially malignant to us," [82] the Assistant Secretary told him. But Lincoln, free from vindictiveness and anxious to heal the factionalism that threatened both the party and the Union, answered Fox: [83]

You have more of that feeling of personal resentment than I. Perhaps I may have too little of it, but I never thought it paid. A man has not time to spend half his life in quarrels. If any man ceases to attack me, I never remember the past against him. It has seemed to me recently that Winter Davis was growing more sensible to his own true interests and has ceased wasting his time by attacking me. I hope for his own good he has. He has been very malicious against me but has only injured himself by it. His conduct has been very strange to me. I came here, his friend, wishing to continue so. I had heard nothing but good of him; he was the cousin of my intimate friend Judge Davis. But he had scarcely been elected when I began to learn of his attacking me on all possible occasions.

On January 30, 1865, when the annual Naval Appropriation Bill came before Congress once more, Hale and Davis jointly assailed the Navy Department—the former in the Senate, the latter in the House. Hale attacked the Blair kinsman, Fox, and held forth on the shabby treatment which the Department had accorded Davis's friend, Admiral Du Pont.[84] Davis moved amendments in the House creating a " Board of Admiralty," consisting of high-ranking naval officers whose all-embracing duties would be to " deliberate in common and advise the Secretary [of the Navy] on . . . the direction, employment, and disposition of the naval forces in time of war." [85] This proposal was naturally to shear the power of Welles and Fox. A few weeks later—February 17—Davis's co-sponsor of the radical " Congressional " reconstruction measure of the year previous, Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio, introduced in the Senate legislation for the creation of a Board of

[81] G. V. Fox to Chandler, February 6, 1865, William E. Chandler Papers, Library of Congress; *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 485; II, 247; Paullin, " President Lincoln and the Navy," *op. cit.*, p. 286; *Congressional Globe*, 38th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 362-363, 489-901, 851; New York *Herald*, January 31, 1865.

[82] Dennett, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

[83] John Hay quoting Lincoln, in *ibid.*, pp. 234-235.

[84] *Congressional Globe*, 38th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 489-491.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 509. The New York *Herald*, January 31, 1865, correctly stated that Davis's action was " a co-operative movement with Senator Hale, each of these gentlemen availing themselves of the opportunity to avenge their grievances and annihilate Secretary Welles and Captain Fox by a simultaneous discharge of their rhetorical batteries."

Admiralty, similar to Davis's in the House.[86] In the debate that followed Hale took the Senate floor and intemperately accused Fox: " It was the Assistant Secretary of the Navy who sent . . . spies to Boston and Portsmouth, instructing them to inquire especially into any connection that I might have had with any contracts for the Navy Department." [87] So the fight against the Navy Department raged in both houses of Congress.

Welles and Fox retaliated against Davis and Hale and Wade and their radical associates by requesting Congress to provide for the creation of a law officer of the Navy Department—the " Solicitor and Naval Judge-Advocate General." Congress approved the request—whereupon Welles and Fox recommended to Lincoln that Hale's bitter foe in New Hampshire politics, William E. Chandler, be appointed to the new position. Lincoln agreed. Youthful state legislator, chairman of the Republican Committee of the Granite State, brilliant strategist of the election craft, and loyal Lincoln supporter against the radical element, Chandler had recently led the successful fight in the New Hampshire Legislature against Hale's re-election to the Senate.[88] There is strong evidence that Fox brought the able Chandler into the Navy Department to act as a sort of *liaison* agent between the Department and the conservative, or pro-Lincoln members of the Senate and House naval affairs committees.[89]

In late February the Davis-Wade proposal for creation of a Board of Admiralty was overwhelmingly defeated in both houses of Congress. Fox could then write to Chandler: [90]

> Hale and Davis and Wade have given us a very small trouble. They were easily beaten. The Admiralty bill was aimed at me. It got one vote in the Senate—John P. Hale!
>
> I dont think there is the slightest chance of these fellows to get Mr. Welles out. I told the Prest. that. We both went together. Blair will not get the U. S. Senate. The War and Treasy Dept both fight him which is enough.

---

[86] *Congressional Globe*, 38th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 850-851.

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 851.

[88] Leon B. Richardson, *William E. Chandler, Republican* (New York, 1940), pp. 43-46, 54; Charles O. Paullin, "A Half Century of Naval Administration in America, 1861-1911," *Proceedings, United States Naval Institute*, XXXVIII, 1912, 1322-1323; *Portsmouth* (New Hampshire) *Journal of Literature and Politics*, January 9, 1864.

[89] Fox to Chandler, February 6, 23, 1865, William E. Chandler Papers.

[90] Fox to Chandler, February 23, 1865, *ibid.*

Fox's reference to the Senate related to the seat left vacant by the death of Senator Hicks of Maryland the week previous—which made the Davis-Blair controversy flare anew.[91] Immediately a mad scramble ensued between Montgomery Blair and Davis's lieutenant, Congressman John A. J. Creswell, for Hicks's Senate place. At Annapolis the Legislature waxed warm over rival candidates, the conservative members supporting Blair for Senator because he was "expected to favor compensation for the slaves liberated," while the "radical" members (or Unconditional Emancipationists) worked for Creswell's election.[92] Although Lincoln was said to favor Blair, the War Department patronage in Maryland, at the radical Stanton's direction, and the pro-Chase hold-overs in the Treasury Department were utilized for Creswell in his fight against Blair for the Senate.[93] The Baltimore *Clipper*, friendly to the Blairs, charged bitterly: "The purse and the sword, the Treasury of the United States and all the patronage of the War Department may elect him [Creswell]. . . . No person ever wished him to be a candidate but Henry Winter Davis and his friends."[94] The Maryland Legislature, under Davis's adept management, chose Creswell to fill Hicks's unexpired term in the Senate.[95] Again the Davisites had triumphed over the Blairs.

Creswell's election to the Senate brought no improvement in the Maryland impasse, though Lincoln tried valiantly to bring peace. But the warring factions were in no mood to listen. The Blairs, stung by Montgomery's defeats—his withdrawal from the Cabinet, his failure to win the Chief Justiceship, and now his defeat for the Senate—did not want an end of hostilities.[96] Neither did Davis, flushed as he was by Creswell's victory under his maneuvering.

The Blairites' next move was to induce Lincoln to remove Davis's ally, Hoffman, from the collectorship of the Port of

[91] Welles wrote: "The death of Governor Hicks has brought on a crisis of parties in Maryland. Blair is a candidate for the position of Senator, and the President wishes him elected, but Stanton and the Chase influence, including the Treasury, do not, and hence the whole influence of those Departments is against him. See *Diary of Gideon Welles*, II, 243.

[92] *New York Herald*, February 18, 1865.

[93] *Diary of Gideon Welles*, II, 243.

[94] Baltimore *Clipper*, March 6, 1865.

[95] Elizabeth M. Grimes, "John Angel James Creswell, Postmaster General," MS., M. A. thesis, Columbia University, 1939, pp. 2-4. Copy in Burgess Library, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

[96] F. P. Blair, Jr., to Montgomery Blair, April 9, 1865, Blair Papers.

Baltimore. By this time (March, 1865) the President, his patience at an end, had made up his mind to reshuffle the entire Baltimore patronage—perhaps to clip Davis's power because of his long insurgency but more probably in order to harmonize the conflicting Maryland factions by recognizing both groups more equitably. Creswell in his new position as United States Senator would, in accordance with custom and tradition, be given a powerful voice by Lincoln in the matter. Now Davis, preparing to fight, advised Creswell sternly during this month: [97]

> I have been reflecting on the proposed Custom House arrangements & the more I think of it the more serious & dangerous it looks.
>
> I sounded Bond & Stirling. . . . B. & S. were unwilling to agree unless it were especially agreed the patronage should be disposed of *wholly* to our satisfaction you of course included. . . .
>
> I wish you to revise the ground & act prudently. Dont buy enemies nor pay allies from necessity at the expense of our best friends.
>
> Let the Custom House stand unless there is an absolute union of the head proposed with us & a dissolution of relations with Swann & Blair.
>
> A word for yourself in absolute confidence. Some of our friends think or are inclined to think you prefer to coalesce with our enemies too readily for temporary purposes. I have combated (*sic*) it sharply but you will understand how such a suspicion will impair your just influence.

Davis's fears that Creswell was not averse to co-operating with the Blairites were well founded. For the Senator and Blair's chief associate, Governor Thomas Swann, drew up a new slate of federal appointments for Baltimore. The following month—April, 1865—Creswell and Swann sent to the White House the following list of names on which they had agreed:[98]

For Collector	Edwin H. Webster Bel-Air, Harford Co'y, Md.
Post Master	Genl. Andrew W. Denison Baltimore, Md.
Surveyor	Edington Fulton Baltimore, Md.
Naval Officer	Samuel M. Evans Baltimore, Md.

[97] H. Winter Davis to Creswell, March, 1865, Creswell Papers. No date is given in this letter, but it is inserted after Floyd to Creswell.

[98] A facsimile of this list is printed in Emanuel Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln: A New Portrait* (New York, 1931), Vol. II, opposite page 900. This list, with only a slight modification, appeared in the Baltimore press two days after Lincoln died. See Baltimore *Clipper*, April 17, 1865.

Marshal	James W. Clayton Baltimore, Md.
District Attorney	Wm. J. Jones Elkton, Cecil County, Md.
Navy Agent	Doctor Thomas King Carroll Cambridge, Md.
Appraiser	Robert G. Proud Baltimore, Md.
Appraiser	Thomas A. Smith Urbana, Frederick Co'y
Appraiser	Ephraim F. Anderson Hagerstown, Washington County, Md.

Under this list—dated April 14, 1865!—Lincoln wrote the words: [99]

Gov. Swann and Senator Creswell present the above today, which they do on a plan suggested by me.

A. L.

April 14, 1865.

Several days after the assassination one Baltimore journal referred to Lincoln's "selection" of the above office-holders for Maryland as "one of the last official acts of the lamented President." [100] At least one of the proposed selections—Edwin H. Webster for the important Baltimore collectorship—was appointed by Lincoln's successor, Andrew Johnson.[101]

The Maryland factional fight over power and patronage and over the dual issue of Negro emancipation and reconstruction, not having been settled when Lincoln met his death, remained to plague President Johnson. Although Davis ended his service in Congress, returned to the law and passed away the last day of the year in which Lincoln died and the War terminated,[102] Maryland's other stormy petrel, Montgomery Blair, attempted to take a new lease on political life. Blair became an adviser of Johnson and unsuccessfully endeavored to persuade the new President to remove Stanton as Secretary of War and have Ulysses S. Grant and then his brother, Frank, appointed to his place.[103]

[99] Hertz, *loc. cit.*
[100] Baltimore *Clipper*, April 17, 1865.
[101] *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927*, p. 1678.
[102] Steiner, *op. cit.*, pp. 350-372.
[103] Smith, *op. cit.*, II, 328-338.

The fierce feud between Davis and Blair—ended only when retirement and then death removed Davis from the scene—had tormented Lincoln until the latter's end. In its larger phase the Davis-Blair rivalry was a significant aspect of the struggle between radicals and conservatives during the War and was to hold over into Johnson's administration to contribute to the dêbacle of Reconstruction.

Columbia University.

BENNET ALLEN, FIGHTING PARSON

By Josephine Fisher

(Concluded from Vol. XXXVIII, page 322, December, 1943)

That Dulany should be anxious to present his version of the unfortunate occurrences in Frederick to the authorities at home is understandable because Allen had again publicly attempted to connect his own interests with those of the Proprietor and to make his quarrel Lord Baltimore's. In describing "Mr. W. D." in a Philadelphia newspaper he said, "This is the man, who, in possession of £1500 a year, insults his Noble and generous Benefactor by his Words, defies him by his Actions, and wrests the Government of the Province out of his Hands, by the Fury of a Mob . . . the security of . . . the Prerogative will be the security of my Property." [156] Dulany's defense was that his salary as Commissary was less than half that sum and that "even if it were true I think he is by no Means entitled to his Lordship's thanks for publishing such a view . . . for ye Lower Ho. are always glad to catch at any Pretence for reducing ye Fees of his Lordships officers. . . ." [157]

This was a serious accusation to bring against an important government official and at the request of Dulany the Council attempted to make an investigation of the charges. Sharpe asked the parson to attend a meeting of the Council where notice would be taken of the publication "in which Mr Walter Dulany . . . or some person that enjoys an honourable and lucrative Office in this Government, is positively accused of raising the Mob in Fredericktown. . . . If you can undertake to prove that fact; and what else is asserted or suggested in that piece relative to the Conduct of the

[156] *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, September 12, 1768.
[157] W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers.

Person accused, it would, I think, be well for you to do so on that occasion, so that his Behaviour might be properly certified to the Lord Proprietor." [158] Dulany maintained that an investigation by the Council would be " a decisive Mode of trying ye Merits of an Accusation, and much more eligible . . . than ye novel unprecedented Method introduced by Mr Allen of attacking Persons in his Lordship's Service with charges of Disaffection in ye public Papers exposing his Govern^t to ye Contempt of ye whole World, and even of introducing his Name upon all Occasions with Irreverence and Disrespect, tho' intermixed with . . . Adulation, too gross, too fulsome, too servile to be countenaced by a Person of his Lordship's Understanding and ingenuous Disposition." [159] But Allen was unwilling to attend the meeting and gave three reasons for his refusal: first, there was no obligation for him to appear before the Council and " obeying a summons of this kind would be of a dangerous tendency "; secondly, no court in Maryland could take cognizance of an article printed in another province [160] and thirdly, he did not consider himself " liable for the Consequences, the piece being anonymous." [161] Exasperating as this answer must have been and although the Council believed there was no foundation for the " indecent insinuations " in the publication, their opinion was that since Allen refused to appear the Governor could take no further notice of " a matter so irregularly suggested." [162] Another communication which was also published in the *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, was not discussed at the meeting of the Council although it not only contained a more violent attack on Dulany [163] but also recklessly included some thinly veiled criticism of the Governor.[164] Perhaps this attack was not noticed officially because it was signed merely " A Friend."

[158] Sharpe to Allen, September 26, 1768, *Archives*, XXXII, 252.

[159] W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers.

[160] The article had been reprinted in the *Maryland Gazette* but Allen said that this was " without the request as far as I know of the Author." Allen to Sharpe, *Archives*, XXXII, 252-253.

[161] *Ibid.* It was signed " B. A." *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, September 21, 1768.

[162] Council Meeting, October 10, 1768, *Archives*, XXXII, 253-255.

[163] " Is not a Counsellor . . . in duty bound to support and defend the legal rights and just Prerogative of his Lord Proprietary against the encroachments of the people . . . ? Can the people trust a man who has wronged his Prince? " The writer implied that " a certain Councellor " bore the marks of " a base birth, mean education and contemptible understanding " and was addicted to " whoring, drinking . . . corruption, bribery . . ." *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, September 26, 1768, Supplement.

[164] " Are not frequent mobs and riots a sign of a weak administration? " *ibid.*

Obviously by this time the state of feeling must have been tremendous and the scene which occurred when the two chief antagonists met in the streets of Annapolis on a Sunday afternoon early in November, although deplorable, would seem to have been inevitable. Mr. and Mrs. Walter Dulany with their two daughters were walking toward the house of Mr. Daniel Dulany where they had been invited to dine.[165] They were joined on the way by another of the dinner guests, Mr. Daniel Wolstenholme who was on horseback; he was lame and after apologizing to the ladies for not accompanying them on foot he rode his horse at a walk behind them. Suddenly Mr. Dulany was seen to change his course and hasten toward a gentleman who was coming up the street. When Mr. Wolstenholme recognized the newcomer as Mr. Allen he hurriedly tied his horse to a paling fence and hastened forward "with a view of preventing their Fighting, if possible," but by the time he arrived on the scene "the Gentlemen were closely engaged" with canes as their weapons.[166] Wolstenholme was unable to say who struck the first blow,[167] but the parson claimed that "Mr. D. saluted me, without speaking a Word, with a Rap over the Head with his Cane. This I returned."[168] Wolstenholme shouted, "For Shame, Gentlemen or words to that Effect; but finding himself unable to part them, by Reason of the Height of their Resentment, without a Probability of suffering Blows from each, he retreated some Steps back, to wait the Event." The honors of victory fell to Mr. Dulany; he was able to deprive his opponent of his stick which was found to contain a sword and immediately taken into custody by Wolstenholme.[169] Allen, however, was unwilling to surrender; removing his coat, he swore "By God, I will box you." The crowd which by then had gathered were, according to Wolstenholme, "staring, as well they might, at such a striking Novelty." But hostilities were ended by Miss Allen who appeared suddenly upon the scene and fran-

[165] Hand bill, November 9, 1768, signed Bennet Allen, Gilmor Papers, I, p. 69. Hereafter cited as Allen Handbill.

[166] Handbill, November 9, 1768, signed Daniel Wolstenholme, Gilmor Papers, I, p. 69. Hereafter cited as Wolstenholme Handbill.

[167] *Ibid.*

[168] Allen Handbill.

[169] Wolstenholme thought it "justice due to Mr. Allen, to declare, That as far as I could observe, he did not endeavour to strike Mr. Dulany with the Tuck End of his stick." Wolstenholme Handbill.

tically clasped her brother so firmly in her arms that " with *all his Struggling*, he could not disengage himself."[170]

The outcome of this engagement was not unnaturally the source of some amusement to the Dulany party. " Ye Booby acquitted himself, as was expected, like a poltroon " was the verdict.[171] He had been soundly thrashed by Dulany who was " a heavy, gouty and clumsy man " [172] and finally subdued by his sister who was described as rather fragile.[173] He was advised to cease " affecting an ostentatious Parade of Qualities he neither possesses, nor are in the least essential to his Character as a Minister." [174]

After this encounter and another impulsive attack made by Allen on Dulany a few days later, again in the streets of Annapolis,[175] the parson showed a decided, although rather ungraciously expressed, willingness to let bygones be bygones. He explained that " It was recommended to me in strong Terms from home in my last letters to compromise Matters " and promised that unless Mr. Dulany renewed his attacks " no new Cause of Contest, or Altercation, shall be given on my side." [176] Apparently a truce was arranged.[177] Two years later however Dulany accused the parson of attempting, unsuccessfully, to bribe an indentured servant to assassinate him.[178] Allen defended himself ably; he maintained that as to the quarrel, he had " long since forgiven and forgot it " and pointed out that for him to have trusted a recently purchased indentured servant with such an errand would have been " Folly, or rather Madness "; he believed that the servant had told the tale in order to gain his freedom and agreed with many of the people of Maryland that the fact that " the most abandoned of the human species, . . . who were capable of any-

[170] *Ibid.*

[171] Boucher to James, November 26, 1768, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, VIII, 35.

[172] Boucher, *Reminiscences*, p. 56.

[173] Boucher to James, November 26, 1768, *loc. cit.* Allen's explanation was that "A Sister's Arms have Force, when we know her Intercession proceeds from a Warmth of Affection.—The same Principle that gave her Strength might conduce to weaken me to *disengage* myself by *struggles* which might have injured her Person." Allen Handbill.

[174] Wolstenholme Handbill.

[175] Allen said that his lack of premeditation was proved by the fact that the attack was made "with a small cane, not at all suitable to the Purpose." Allen Handbill.

[176] *Ibid.*

[177] "A final suspension of hostilities was agreed upon by the Mediation of Mr. John Hammond in November 1768." *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.

[178] Statement written by Walter Dulany, September 18, 1770. Dulany Papers, II, 53.

thing to shake off their yokes" were pouring into the Province, constituted a serious menace. The accusation however was considered sufficiently serious for the parson to be bound to appear before the Provincial Court in order to answer it.[179]

In the meantime Allen's career in civil office was also proving to be a stormy one. Supervision over the Agent and Receiver General of the Taxes was exercised by the Board of Revenue [180] and when one discovers that during the time Allen held the office the Board was composed of five members who included the Governor and Daniel and Walter Dulany while the secretary was John Clapham [181] one would expect friction and one would not be disappointed. The chief struggle arose when the unexpected news arrived from England that the Proprietor, on learning of Allen's appointment as Agent, was " surprised & displeased at the hasty Appointment of M^r^ Allen to the sole Exercise & Administration of so Capital a Department. He always desired . . . such an establishment for M^r^ Allen as might place him upon an independent Footing & if he could not proceed efficiently in his Ecclesiastical Walk that a Secular Employ might be found for him . . . but His Ldp never entertained the least Imagination of Conferring the first Employ in the Province . . . on him." [182] By sending a commission appointing Matthew Tilghman to the office Lord Baltimore provided for the removal of Allen[183] One cannot help sympathizing with the Governor's bewildered indignation at this unexpected rebuke. He defended his action by quoting the orders he had received, which were to give Allen a good post and which mentioned specifically that he might be given any office " now vacant or which may become so . . . in Consequence of any Resignation of M^r^ Lloyd [the former Agent and Receiver General] . . . His Ldp desires & expects M^r^ Allen may be immediately promoted & the better it is & the sooner it reaches him His Ldp will be the better pleased." [184]

[179] *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.
[180] *Archives*, XXXII, 396-407.
[181] Clapham, the son-in-law of Mrs. Green, the printer of the *Maryland Gazette*, had engaged in a quarrel with Allen after that paper had refused to continue publishing Allen's articles unless he signed them or posted a bond to indemnify the printer. *Maryland Gazette*, September 22, November 17, December 8, 1768; *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, October 17, 1768.
[182] Quoted by Sharpe in a letter to Hamersley, October 30, 1768, *Archives*, XIV, 544.
[183] *Archives*, XXXII, 411.
[184] Sharpe to Hamersley, October 30, 1768. *Archives*, XIV, 544.

The explanation of Lord Baltimore's sudden change of heart is found in a letter to Walter Dulany from Hamersley in which he said of Allen that

> His Lordship once had a great regard for him, but all his Measures from the time of his Arrival in the Province, particularly in attacking his Lordship's best friends, your Brother and yourself, his Turning his Pen against the Colonies & Indecent Outragious behav[r] on his Institut[n] at Frederick, as well as his Subseq[t] conduct have been very ill calculated to encrease it, and I believe his Lordship has wrote him with his own hand, that the most acceptable Service he can render, will be to retire to his living, and be quiet—an advice I sincerely hope he will take for his own Sake.[185]

When faced with the necessity of making a choice between his favorite and the Dulany family Lord Baltimore chose the Dulanys.

But Allen refused to accept his dismissal from office gracefully. In fact he maintained that he had not been dismissed. In making provincial appointments the usual procedure was for the governor to issue the commission and only occasionally were direct commissions sent over by the proprietor. Since however a law of the Province forbade the holding of office without at least three year's residence unless the commission came from the proprietor, Lord Baltimore at the time he decided to provide for his protégé in the civil establishment, had sent a blank commission for Allen with the office to be filled in by the governor[186] and it was by this commission that Allen had received his appointment as Agent. The commission by which Allen was superseded by Tilghman was also an immediate one but Tilghman refused the office. Sharpe with the advice of the Board of Revenue then appointed Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer and an accounting was demanded from Allen; but the parson claimed that since his appointment had been made by the proprietor, a commission issued by the governor could not deprive him of the office and that his commission would be valid " until superseded by the power that granted it." [187] He also asserted that the Board of Revenue did possess the power to take action, " the Board of the Treasury in England having just as much right of displacing the Lord Treasurer, as the Board of Revenue have of removing an Agent here. . . . " [188] As to the

[185] Hamersley to Walter Dulany, August 1, 1769. Dulany Papers.
[186] Hamersley to Sharpe, November 10, 1768, *Archives*, XIV, 433.
[187] *Archives*, XXXII, 411-414.
[188] Allen to Sharpe, November 29, 1768, *ibid.*, p. 415.

auditing of his accounts he said that on being appointed to office he had been informed by the Board that his accounts to September 29 would be due on March 25 in every year and that he intended to abide by those orders; [189] and that although he could easily produce the accounts at any moment " it was a matter of Punctilio, and that he did not chuse to gratify the Board." [190]

He adopted rather petty delaying tactics; he was not " at home " when Jenifer went to his house with an order from the Governor for the delivery of papers relative to the Agent's office [191] nor would he receive the Attorney General who was delegated by the Board to point out to Allen the " Irregularity and Indiscretion of his Conduct and to advise him to comply with the order of the Board." [192] By the beginning of 1769 he had abandoned his claim to the office, probably because the Board had threatened to put his bond in suit,[193] but he continued to cling to his policy of obstruction. Jenifer found it necessary on January 25 to consult the Board " in regard to some Difficulties he was under relative to the execution of the office of Agent and Receiver General " since he had been unable to get " any Papers or Information from the late Agent respecting sums he may have rec^{d} on His Ldp's acc^{t}." [194] It was not until March 25, the day on which he had said he would hand over his accounts but two months after he had been notified " that he will be looked upon as Answerable for every Consequence that may attend a failure " to supply Jenifer immediately with the necessary information, that Allen delivered to the Board his accounts to September 29, 1768.[195] He had achieved the satisfaction at the cost of causing what must have been grave inconvenience to the administration of the proprietary revenues, of stubbornly carrying through his program of adhering to the orders issued by the Board at the time it was believed that he was to be the permanent Agent. Although the accounts were " very irregularly stated," the Board was still patient and wrote the parson requesting him to " state them anew " and offering him the assistance of the Clerk of the Board should he need it in drawing

[189] Same to same, November 25, 1768, *ibid.*, p. 412.
[190] Meeting of the Board of Revenue, December 5, 1768, *ibid.*, p. 419.
[191] *Ibid.*, pp. 414-418.
[192] *Ibid.*, pp. 417-418.
[193] *Ibid.*, p. 417.
[194] *Ibid.*, pp. 442.
[195] *Ibid.*, pp. 442-444.

them up.[196] In answer they received a letter from Miss Allen stating that her brother was suffering from an attack of the gout and " that as soon as he is well enough to attend Business I shall give him their letter." [197] This was too much for the Board to endure and orders were given that his bond be put in suit immediately.[198]

The result was apparently unexpected and quite shattering to the parson. " If anything," he said, " could astonish me in this Country, it would be the arrest I was put under on Wednesday last, at the Horse Race [189] in the face of the whole Province at the Suit of the Lord Proprietary." [200] In spite of his presence at the races he insisted that it was " his extreme illness . . . and total incapacity for business " which had prevented his complying with the Board's last order and that he would immediately obey it " if Your Excellency will be pleased to befriend me so far as to direct the Writ to be withdrawn." [201] He was evidently unsure to what extent he could still rely on the protection of the Proprietor; he said he was " far from thinking his Lordship conscious of so violent a proceeding . . . " but went on to suggest that Sharpe should consider " If Things were driven to an extremity . . . how far his Lordship's Credit may suffer, after the various Assurances of Support & promises of protection he has made me . . . "; on the other hand he threatened, if Baltimore were ignorant of the proceedings " how far your Excel^{y} may escape censure, in an affair of so delicate a nature, and which will be severely canvass'd both in England & America." Apparently he even felt some doubt concerning the way he had administered the office of Agent, for he said, " I trust it will appear that I have Acted upon the Credit of my own Bond as uprightly and faithfully as if it was supported by that of the most responsible Securities, and even could any flaw be found in it, I have known Lord B. too long, and have too good opinion of him to conceive he would take undue advantage

[196] Ibid., p. 446. Allen however maintained " that he was satisfied that the Board had injured him as much as it was in their Power to do, that they could not prejudice him more than they had done." *Ibid.*, p. 419.

[197] Elizabeth Allen to John Clapham, April 10, 1769, *ibid.*, p. 446.

[198] *Ibid.*

[199] The Annapolis races were held on May 2, 3 and 4 in 1769 " on the Race-Ground near this City." On the day of Allen's arrest Mr. McGill's Nonpareil, Mr. Galloway's Selim and Dr. Hamilton's Ranger ran for a purse of one hundred pounds. *Maryland Gazette*, April 27, 1769, May 4, 1769.

[200] Allen to Sharpe, May 11, 1769, *Archives*, XXXII, 447.

[201] *Ibid.*, p. 449.

of it, or subject a man, to whom he had once professed a Friendship to so ignominious a Process." [202]

The Board was not vindictive. Allen was informed that if "he will without delay submit . . . a regular Account of his Transactions during the Time of his having acted in the office of Agent & make Satisfaction of the Sum which shall be found due to His Lordship on such Account; the Process against him shall be withdrawn, as thereby the end, or purpose thereof, will be Answered." [203] Delays continued which apparently were the result of Allen's inability to state his accounts "in a mercantile manner," [204] but eventually, in June 1771 after Robert Eden had succeeded Sharpe as governor, they were passed by the Board with reservations.[205]

In the midst of these difficuties Allen found time to involve himself in political controversy. After his arrival in Maryland he had devoted some attention to the study of politics and considered the subject "a flattering one, as it gives a man a high opinion of his own abilities to manage adroitly so many minds with much dissonant dispositions, & jarring interests." [206] Fortified by this comforting belief he did not hesitate to express publicly his criticism of the attitude of the colonists toward the British government when his study of local politics had led him to the conclusion that "Mr Pitt has infatuated the minds of these people. The Spirit of Anarchy & Confusion is gone forth & God Knows where it will stop. . . ." [207] He elaborated this theme in three articles signed "Machiavel" published in the *Pennsylvania*

[202] *Ibid.*, p. 449. A postscript in which he excused his pen and paper as the best which he could obtain suggests that the letter was written from prison; it was dated April 9 which was probably an error caused by agitation since at the meeting of the Board of Revenue held on May 11, 1769, it was stated that the letter was received on the "10th instant," *ibid.*, p. 447.

[203] Meeting of the Board of Revenue, May 11, 1769, *ibid.*, p. 449.

[204] Meeting of the Board of Revenue, March 26, 1770, *ibid.*, p. 463. He lost the services of his clerk when they quarreled about the salary; Allan to Sharpe, May 15, 1769, *ibid.*, pp. 450-451. Apparently the accounts were finally drawn up by William Eddis and John Clapham, Meeting of the Board of Revenue, March 26, 1770, *ibid.*, p. 463.

[205] They were approved "provided the Remittances and payments therein charged have been made, no vouchers having been produced except for the Sum of £403..12..3 paid to the present Agent and a Bond for the Sum of £147..15 lodged in the Revenue Office." Meeting of the Board of Revenue, June 6, 1771, *ibid.*, p. 468.

[206] Allen to Baltimore, August 27, 1767, Calvert Papers, 1307.

[207] Same to same, February, 1767, Calvert Papers, 1303.

Chronicle in the summer of 1768,[208] in which he upheld the then unpopular theory that "America had thrown off all allegiance to Great Britain . . . since the treatment accorded to the officers appointed by the king to collect the Stamp tax can only be considered a denial of the authority which appointed them." [209] Walter Dulany would not believe that the parson was defending a principle and claimed that he was

exerting his feeble Efforts to bring into Contempt a Pamphlet [210] written by my brother in relation to ye Stamp Act, which was rec'd with universal Approbation both in England & America . . . it is apparent that Mr Pitt grounded his whole Argument for Repeal upon ye Principles of this Pamphlet, and not a single Pen has ever appear'd against it but ye Parson's.[211]

The articles were taken sufficiently seriously for threats to be made against their author [212] and according to Walter Dulany their result was "to bring upon his Back ye universal Hatred of ye People in America." [213] Another accusation of plagiarism followed this publication; it was said that "some resemblances of Swift's 'Discourse of the Contents and Dissentions between the Nobles and the Commons in Athens, Rome, etc.' is discoverable in the illustrations and style, in the historical deductions and political reflections." [214] Swift, as the critic pointed out, was an unwise choice for he was "an author in everybody's hands." [215] Perhaps the most serious result for Allen of "his turning his Pen against the Colonies" was that it helped to lose him the favor of Lord Baltimore.[216]

[208] W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers, II, 51.

[209] *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, August 8, 15, 22, 1768. At another time Allen claimed that he had written in favor of repeal of the Stamp Act in *St. James's Chronicle*, under the signature of Sebastian Cabot. Allen, *Address to the Parishioners*, p. 7.

[210] Daniel Dulany, *The Considerations on the Propriety of Imposing Taxes in the British Colonies for the Purpose of Raising a Revenue, by Act of Parliament* (Annapolis, 1765).

[211] W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768, Dulany Papers, II, 51. "Machiavel" compared Daniel Dulany to Anthony, John Dickinson to Octavius and James Otis to Lepidus, *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, August 8, 1768.

[212] *Ibid.*, September 12 and 19, 1768.

[213] W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768.

[214] *Pennsylvania Chronicle*, October 12, 1768. Reprinted in the *Maryland Gazette*, October 20, 1768, supplement.

[215] *Ibid.* Dulany reported that Allen had "brought himself . . . into great Contempt as a Writer by those Publications, for he is detected of stealing almost ye whole" from Swift. W. D. to Hamersley, September 29, 1768.

[216] Hamersley to Walter Dulany, August 1, 1769, Dulany Papers, I, 44.

Allen also took an active part in the controversies concerning the Established Church which helped to agitate the province in the years immediately preceding the Revolution. On the obviously important question of the reform of the government of the Church Allen was a member of the High Church group which criticized as "unconstitutional and palpably Presbyterian" the plan advocated by some of the clergy of setting up an ecclesiastical court to be composed of laymen as well as clergy and advocated instead the establishment of an American episcopate.[217] He was the author of a pamphlet, *A Reply to the Church of England Planter's First Letter respecting the Clergy*,[218] signed "A Constitutionalist," which was written in 1770 to refute arguments that the clergy should receive lower salaries and be subject to control by their vestries. These Proposals had been made in a handbill signed by "A Church of England Planter." [219]

Except for these suitable activities Allen appears to have accepted the advice sent him by Lord Baltimore, "to retire to his living and be quiet." [220] He attempted to conciliate the parishioners of All Saints' by announcing that he wanted peace and would do all that he could to benefit the parish [221] and, although the parish was not divided, three curates chosen by the vestry [222] with a salary of £150 "Common Money, exclusive of Perquisites" were provided.[223] The parson explained to his parishioners that the system of having curates was more beneficial to their interest than a division of the parish would be, since rectors "would have been more independent, and therefore, through the Frailty of Nature, more liable to have neglected their Duty than Assistants, whose Dependence is on good Behaviour." [224]

Many of the inhabitants of Frederick county were German and the parson attempted to win their support; he declared that the rumor that he intended to "level their Steeple with that of Church"

[217] *Archives*, XXXII, 379-387.
[218] Wroth, *op. cit.*, p. 234. It was published in Annapolis by Anna Catherine Green and a copy is in Gilmor Papers, I, 2. Hereafter cited as Allen, *A Reply*.
[219] *Ibid.*
[220] Hamersley to Walter Dulany, August 1, 1769, Dulany Papers, I, 44.
[221] Allen, *Address to the Parishioners*, pp. 10-11.
[222] *Maryland Gazette*, June 8, 1769.
[223] *Ibid.* Their salary was paid by Allen. American Loyalists, Audit Office Manuscripts, Vol. 35, bk. 1, 467. Transcripts in the New York Public Library. Hereafter cited as Loyalist Transcripts.
[224] Allen, *Address to the Parishioners*, p. 10.

was false and he expressed great admiration for the "Dutch." [225] He agreed to pay £25 annually toward the support of ministers for both the Lutheran and the Dutch Reformed churches.[226] One would like to know what explanation lay behind this unexpectedly princely gesture; possibly Allen agreed to the arrangement as the result of official pressure exerted in order to make Maryland as attractive as Pennsylvania to German settlers.[227] There was however apparently some difficulty in collecting the money from the parson for the accounts of the Lutheran church in 1775 show "Expenditure for Sheriff because of Mr. Allen, 0. 7. 7." [228] But the next year the church received £50 from the parson.[229] When writing anonymously Allen expressed far less enthusiasm for what he described as "the back Parts of the Province, where three fourths of the inhabitants are foreigners, invincibly attached to their own Religion, Language and Manners, amongst whom no Clergymen of the Church of England can hope for any more Respect than his Humanity entitles him to or his Income commands." [230] But evidently his efforts to make himself popular bore some fruit for he was able to boast publicly that "I made it my particular study to cultivate the Goodwill and Affection of all my loving Friends of every Denomination in Frederick County, not, I flatter myself without some Success." [231] The Dulanys remained unmoved but their friend Jonathan Boucher, at last settled at St. Ann's in Annapolis, showed signs of softening; he said that although Allen was "contemptible in the eyes of all" he would strive to be "decent to him." [232] He was on friendly terms with an eminent fellow Wadhamite,[233] the Reverend Mr. Richard

[225] *Ibid.*

[226] Ernest Helfenstein, *History of All Saints' Parish in Frederick County, Maryland, 1742-1932* (Frederick, 1932), p. 23.

[227] In advocating allowing naturalized citizens to sit in the lower house of the Assembly, Governor Eden pointed out that in Pennsylvania they were given this privilege, which placed Maryland at a disadvantage, "especially as (notwithstanding they maintain their Ministers by Contribution) they are equally taxed with others to support the established Clergy; a Charge to which they are not liable in Pennsylvania." Eden to Lord Dartmouth, January 29, 1773, "Correspondence of Governor Eden," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, II, 303.

[228] Records of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Frederick City, I, 291, Ms. copy, MHE.

[229] *Ibid.*

[230] Allen, *A Reply*, p. 15.

[231] *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.

[232] Boucher to James, June 8, 1770, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, VIII, 39. They were associated together in advocating an American Episcopate, *Archives*, XXXII, 387.

[233] D. A. B., article on Richard Peters.

Peters of Christ Church, Philadelphia,[234] and he made a favorable impression on Lord Fairfax and his brother.[235]

It has been said that the parson spent little time in Frederick [236] but he bought a house in the town in 1774 [237] and was living there with his sister at the outbreak of the Revolution.[238] The establishment included a garden,[239] two Negro slaves,[240] "A new Book case and tables,[241] and "A box of table and Bed Linen" worth £20.[242] His way of life continued to be that of a scholar and a gentleman; his library contained three hundred volumes; he owned manuscripts and prints a cellar of wine worth £30 and a violoncello; [243] and in spite of painful associations he continued to frequent the Annapolis races.[244]

Allen, unlike many of the Church of England clergy in the Province, did not make himself conspicuous by opposition to revolutionary measures. In the beginning of "the troubles" he referred with a light touch to current happenings; he wrote from Frederick to the Reverend Mr. Peters of Philadelphia, "Should the Calamities of War ever force you from your place of residence. You will find welcome Asylum here, which is looked on so safe they make it the magazine of all the powder in the Province and we expect the Ladies to follow it shortly. . . ." [245] Later he claimed that he had "in a variety of Publications vindicated & maintained the authority of the British Gov^t [246] and that in May, 1775, when the dissenting ministers had "preached up Rebellion on the Fast Day app^d by Congress, he thought it his Duty to recommend Peace." [247] He was summoned before the Committee of Observation of Frederick for preaching this sermon but upon examination the Committee found its sentiments "not

[234] Allen to Peters, May 2, 1775, Wayne MSS., HSP.
[235] Lord Fairfax to "My Lord," July 3, 1782, Society Miscellaneous Collection, HSP.
[236] "Mr. Allen, when not in Philadelphia, resided in Hagerstown, visiting the parish church not more than once or twice a year and devoting his attention principally to Antietam congregation." Helfenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.
[237] Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 461. He paid £600 currency for it. *Ibid.*
[238] *Ibid.*, pp. 459, 636-643.
[239] *Ibid.*, p. 461.
[240] Together worth £85 sterling, *ibid.*, p. 457.
[241] *Ibid.*, p. 643.
[242] *Ibid.*
[243] *Ibid.*
[244] *Maryland Gazette*, September 27, 1770.
[245] Allen to Peters, May 2, 1775, Wayne Mss. HSP.
[246] Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 453.
[247] *Ibid.*, pp. 453, 459.

exceptionable." [248] Allen attempted to gloss over this rather tame ending by explaining that had not this been the case "he should have been tarred and feathered." [249] The parson stated emphatically that he had never taken an oath of loyalty to the United States [250] but a list of the members of the Association in Frederick County includes the name of "Bennett Allen." [251]

According to Allen's story, he was considered a person of considerable importance by the rebels. His frontier parish was "the chief nursery of the body of Riflemen [252] and in the summer of 1775 "General Gates who had then just got his Commission called on him & gave him to understand that if he would assist him & General Washington in levying Men in his Parish they would Preserve his Property and situation secure and by way of Enforcement told him the Ministry had nothing so good to give him as he possessed there." But Allen easily withstood the temptation; he asked for time to consider the offer, "not . . . that he was at all dubious as to the Part he should Act but because he wished to gain time." [253] Finally, with "the situation growing daily more critical" and "preferring his Allegiance to the King & his attachment to his native Country to the preservation of his property" he returned to England in September 1775.[254]

But hope for saving his possessions was not entirely abandoned; his faithful sister remained in Frederick in order to try to salvage some of his property.[255] Although she was unsuccessful in her original purpose she was able to make herself of use in other ways since

> From her situation in Frederic Town . . . where many British Prisoners were confined she had an opportunity of rendering them great and important Services in their distressed Situation. . . . Her Donations were

[248] Peter Force, *American Archives*, 4th series, II, 1044-1045.

[249] Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 459. A fellow clergyman who was present when the sermon was preached testified that it "gave great offence as it preached up moderation instead of Opposition to the measures of Great Britain," *ibid.*, pp. 463-464.

[250] "Some Loyalist claims have been dismissed owing to the Claimants having taken the Oaths to the United States—I never was required to take any such Oaths. . . ." Allen to William Tilghman, March 6, 1800, Gratz Collection, HSP.

[251] "Journal of the Committee of Observation of the Middle District of Frederick County, Maryland," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, X, 163.

[252] Allen to J. Goulburn, September 10, 1814, Goulburn Papers, William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

[253] Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 460.

[254] *Ibid.*, p. 453; Allen to Tilghman, March 6, 1800, Gratz Collection, HSP.

[255] Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 637.

bestowed chiefly on those who could not express their wants in Writing whom she furnished with money rum and clothing.[256]

Eventually her kindness to the enemy made her so unpopular with the citizens of Frederick that she was driven from her house [257] and in 1780, finding herself of danger of starvation and her brother's "affairs . . . totally ruined," she returned to England [258] where, since her brother said that he was unable to support her and she was "quite incapable of getting her own Living" she applied to the Lords of the Treasury for an allowance. In 1783 she was granted £5 a year but found this sum "inadequate to her Board in any part of the Kingdom" [259] and in 1786 she was receiving an allowance of £20 a year from the Treasury.[260]

In May of 1781 Allen was among a number of Maryland loyalists who were presented for high treason but the action was discontinued; [261] it was stated that his property was confiscated [262] but the available evidence seems to indicate that although he lost most of his property it was not through confiscation. His losses consisted of the income from All Saints' Parish which for a time was apparently paid but sequestered in the hands of his agent, John Hanson, Jr.,[263] but ceased entirely after the adoption of the Maryland constitution of 1776 which made no provision for payment of the clergy.[264] Allen at first claimed that the living of All Saints' was worth £1000 a year [265] but when pressed for details he said that in 1774 his salary had been £1563. 16 in currency or £938. 5. 8, sterling; [266] the sheriff of Frederick County estimated

[256] She claimed to have spent about £300 for these supplies. *Ibid.*, pp. 637-641.
[257] *Ibid.*, p. 643.
[258] *Ibid.*, pp. 637-639.
[259] *Ibid.*, pp. 639-640.
[260] *Ibid.*, p. 643.
[261] "List of Outlawries, Western Shore." *Md. Hist. Mag.*, IV, 288.
[262] *Ibid.*
[263] "March 19, 1776 . . . Resolved that the . . . Committee petition . . . that all such sums of money as may have been or shall be received by the Sheriff for the use of Mr Bennett Allen shall be paid into the hands of Mr John Hanson Junr his Attorney the Residue after the payment of his just debts to remain there subject to the order of the Convention." "Journal of the Committee of Observation of the Middle District of Frederick County, Maryland, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, XI, 246.
[264] Allen to William Tilghman, April 11, 1803, HSP.
[265] Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 454.
[266] Each of the 7819 taxable inhabitants of the county paid 4 shillings currency for the support of the clergyman. *Ibid.*, p. 457. In 1814 he claimed that when he left Maryland in 1775 his living was £1069. 14 sterling per annum exclusive of fees." Allen to Lord Bathurst, July 18, 1814, Goulburn Papers, I, Clements Library.

that the average value of the living for 1774-1775 was £820 while Governor Sharpe believed that in 1768 the parish had been considered worth £800 sterling.[267] He also suffered from the depreciation of funds left in the hands of his agent [268] and was deprived of a rather questionable claim to 1000 acres of land worth, he said, £600.[269] He listed among his losses household goods valued at £200 [270] and an item, "Loss on Insolvents as stated by Mr Hanson £2176. 7. 1 Currency," which Allen explained as "Debts due for his Salary from Part of his Parishioners." [271] At the time he left the province he was himself indebted for two bonds worth £350.[272]

The parson however received some compensation from the British government for his losses. After his return to England he was given an allowance by the Treasury. This was discontinued in 1782,[273] possibly pending a general investigation of the claims of the American loyalists; powerful friends sprang to his rescue in this crisis and the sum of 140 guineas was subscribed for the support of a man who had suffered as a result of his "Loyalty to the King & . . . attachment to the british Constitution." [274] In 1785 he was receiving £100 a year from the Treasury [275] and under the act of Parliament of June, 1788, he was granted a pension of £300; [276] eventually he was allowed £650 for the loss of his income and £150 for his property losses.[277] These sums were not munificent and Allen did not abandon the hope that he might still win

[267] *Ibid.*, p. 463.

[268] "Loss in 14053 continental Dollars exchanged forty for one agreeable to the Laws of Maryland received by Mr Hanson as Good Money for debts due your Memorialist." *Ibid.*, p. 457. This sum included the money received by Hanson for the sale of Allen's house in Frederick and of two Negroes. *Ibid.*

[269] Allen said that in 1773 he had obtained a warrant from the governor for 1000 acres "to the Westward of Fort Frederick" and that the warrant was returned to the Office but that the outbreak of the war had prevented his obtaining a patent. *Ibid.*, pp. 457, 460-461. Samuel Chase gave as his opinion that the land taken up by Allen "among the Glades in Frederick . . . to be from nine shillings to twelve per annum" [*sic*]. Ibid., p. 457.

[270] *Ibid.*

[271] *Ibid.*, pp. 457, 462-463.

[272] *Ibid.*, p. 454.

[273] Allen to Lord Shelburne, February 4, 1783. Clements Library.

[274] Lord Sackville to Allen, October 11, 1782, Clements Library. Lord Bateman, the Duke of Montague, Lord North, Lord Sackville, Bamber Gascoyne, H. Hamersley and J. Fazakerly each gave 20 guineas. "State of a Voluntary Subscription entered into for the Revd Bennet Allen. Shelburne Papers, Clements Library.

[275] Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 460.

[276] Loyalist Transcripts, II, 78-79.

[277] *Ibid.*

the fortune he had endured exile in the wilds to find. He was encouraged by the adoption of the Convention of January 8, 1802, under which the United States turned over to the British government £600,000 for the payment of debt owed by Americans to British subjects. According to Allen a large proportion of this sum should come to him; the allowance granted the loyalist clergy by the British government, he said, " does not exonerate America . . . " and since his living was in the nature of a freehold [278] " a Constitution [the Maryland constitution of 1776] formed . . . before the independence of the Colonies was acknowledged, could not repeal & annul a law of above 70 Years Standing . . . "; he therefore should receive from the fund provided by the convention " the arrears due to me . . . on account of my Parish from 1775 to 1803." [279] and found precedents for his case in the fact that " at the dissolution of the Monasteries in England, pensions were allowed the Monks and Abbots " and that even the non-juring clergy were provided for at the beginning of the French Revolution.[280] The parson thought that the minimum amount he should receive was " above ninety thousand pounds Sterling . . . ," the arrears of his salary between 1775 and 1803, allowing for an annual increase in population of 535 which was the average for the increase in the three years before the outbreak of the war, with six percent simple interest; " But if the Calculation be made with compound Interest," he suggested hopefully, " the Account would stand thus: Income with increase and compound Interest at 6 p cent 115,319. 6. 0½ Sterling." [281] The commissioners awarded him the sum of £1106 " in part of arrears of . . . Debts contracted before the War began " but refused to consider his claim for salary after 1775.[282]

In 1814 the negotiations of the Treaty of Ghent appeared to Allen to offer an excellent opportunity to force the Americans to pay up, and he expressed to Lord Bathurst the hope that " the British Plenipotentiaries . . . may be instructed to make the

[278] His life tenure of All Saints' was acknowledged, he claimed, by the Maryland Assembly in passing the act of November 21, 1770, which provided for a division of the parish " upon the death or removal of Bennet Allen." Allen to Tilghman, April 11, 1803, HSP.

[279] *Ibid.*

[280] *Ibid.*

[281] *Ibid.*

[282] Allen to Lord Bathurst, July 18, 1814. Goulburn Papers, I, Clements Library.

Liquidation of his Demands one of the Conditions on which Peace may be concluded with the United States." [283] At this time he was attempting to obtain the payment of salary from 1775 to 1783, with interest to 1813; if 5 percent interest were allowed the amount due to him was £48, 985. 9. 10¾ but if he were granted 6 percent which he said was customary in the Province, he would obtain £53,290. 2. 0.[284] He suggested that his claim might be of value to the British plenipotentiares " as a makeweight against the claims which the subjects of the United States will not be backward to make for Spoliations by sea & on their Coasts." [285] But there is no evidence indicating that Allen's case played any part in the negotiations at Ghent.

It was nearly seven years after Allen's return to England that his last and most famous encounter took place with a member of the Dulany family. In 1779 a series of sketches entitled " Characters of some of the leading Men in the present American Rebellion " appeared anonymously in the *Morning Post.* Among the " characters " was that of George Washington who was described as a land speculator whose " abilities are of that mediocrity which created no jealousy "; the private life of Benjamin Franklin was shown in the worst possible light and the hope was expressed that " if the axe or the haltar are to be employed on this occasion . . . the first example could be made of this hoary traitor." Eventually the name of Daniel Dulany of Maryland appeared; he was placed before the public, among the leading men of the rebellion, in the unattractive guise of a person of low origin whose family

> had determined . . . to divide, part coming to England, under character of sufferers in the Royal cause, and part residing in America, to take care of their property, and to be ready to close with the winning side—Policy too common on this occasion as it only serves to prolong the War, and becomes a heavy burden on this Country; there being several of this name and family who have allowances from Government.[286]

The members of the Dulany family, perhaps more than any other family in Maryland, were outstanding in their loyalty to the

[283] *Ibid.*
[284] Allen to Goulburn, September 10, 1814. Goulburn Papers, Clements Library.
[285] Allen to William Adams, August 11, 1814. Goulburn Papers, I, Clements Library.
[286] Quoted from the *Morning Post,* in the *Political Magazine,* July, 1782, pp. 445-446.

old regime and as a result their material losses were heavy.[287] Walter Dulany had died in 1773 [288] but two of his sons joined the Maryland Loyalist Regiment.[289] Daniel Dulany was living in retirement in Maryland, " despised and detested " for his opposition to revolutionary measures; [290] Daniel his elder son was an exile in London [291] and Benjamin, the younger, was apparently the only member of the family who joined the American cause.[292] Lloyd the half brother of Daniel and Walter was also living in England.[293]

The Dulanys had broken their ties with Maryland and their fortunes depended upon the attitude of the British government toward them. There could be no doubt that the *Morning Post* article was not only an insult to their convictions but also a very real danger to the future of the family. Perhaps the fact that there were circumstances which might be interpreted to lend weight to the accusation made it harder to endure; Daniel Dulany had divided most of his property between his two sons, Daniel the loyalist and Benjamin who adhered to the American cause; [294] the younger Daniel Dulany had been granted £400 by the Treasury on his arrival in England and was receiving an allowance of £200 a year.[295]

[287] The numerous offices which had been held by members of the family in the proprietary government were of course abolished and the property of at least five members of the family was confiscated. *Archives*, 48, pp. 436, 459, 539.

[288] *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser*, September 18, 1773.

[289] Captain Grafton Dulany died of a fever in 1778 while the regiment was stationed in Jamaica. W. O. Raymond, ed., *Winslow Papers*, A. D. *1776-1826* (St. John, N. B., 1901), p. 45. Walter Dulany was a Major in the regiment, Lorenzo Sabine, *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution with an Historical Essay* (Boston, 1864), 2 vols., I, 266. Their brother was presented for high treason in 1781, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, IV, 288.

[290] Force, *op. cit.*, 4th series, III, 819-820; Hugh Egerton, *The Royal Commission on the Losses and Services of American Loyalists 1783-1785*, p. 321.

[291] *Ibid.*

[292] *Archives*, 47, *passim.*

[293] According to Governor Eden he had left " a considerable Estate here to escape with his Life from the persecution he has been under, for having withstood every insidious and violent Attempt to draw him into Connection with Men whose Measures he abhors. . . . Eden to Lord Dartmouth, August 27, 1775, *Md. Hist. Mag.*, II, 12. He had been a student at the Middle Temple in 1761 (Joseph Towne Wheeler, " Reading Interests of the Professional Classes in Colonial Maryland, 1770-1776," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, XXXVI, 281) and cultivated an interest in science (Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *The Founding of American Civilization*, Vol. II, " The Old South," [New York, 1942], II, 68).

[294] Egerton, *op. cit.*, p. 321; *Archives*, 47, 422.

[295] Egerton, *op. cit.*, p. 321. It seems probable that Lloyd Dulany was being aided by the British government but his death prevented his name from appearing on any of the available records.

It was Lloyd Dulany who rushed to the defense of the family name. He called upon the editor of the *Morning Post* and persuaded him to publish a retraction of the accusations which had been made against the family [296] together with a peremptory demand that the anonymous author make himself known.[297] After several weeks had passed without a reply Dulany issued a stronger challenge to the author to reveal his name, " that I might see my enemy, and combat him fairly . . . " otherwise, he said, " you must pass with the world for what you know yourself to be, a destestable liar and a cowardly assassin! " [298] Three years however passed before " that old and inveterate enemy to the family, Mr. Bennett Allen " disclosed himself as the author.[299] The reason for his long silence and the sudden breaking of it remains obscure. One explanation was that " it was said that some intricate family affairs respecting money, occasioned Allen to keep himself from being known as the writer. . . . " [300] To Lloyd Dulany Allen merely said, " It is not till the present moment that I find myself at liberty to avow that the character of Daniel Dulany . . . was writen by me." [301] The circumstances were considered odd by the friends of the Dulanys, one of whom wrote, " Thus was this most unhappy affair terminated, after the intermittion of three years, without any fresh provocation on either side; neither had Mr. D. or Mr. A. been for one moment out of Great Britain during the above Period—they had neither spoken or been in Company." [302] But the answer, when it finally arrived on Tuesday, June 18 in 1782, left no doubt of the parson's acceptance of Lloyd Dulany's challenge. Among other things he said:

I know you to be from facts what I am only in your imagination, both an infamous *liar* and a *cowardly assassin.* I shall not go about to recrimi-

---

[296] " The brother of Mr Dulany whose character was given in this paper of Tuesday last, having called at the office and convinced us that the circumstances there alledged against his family are totally groundless; We are happy in the opportunity of publishing this his positive denial of the infamous charges. . . . " *Political Magazine*, 1782, p. 447.

[297] *Ibid.*

[298] *Ibid.* Another version of the letter reads " assassin of a private character." Walter Dulany, Jr., to ———, August 11, 1782, quoting a letter of James Brooks to Captain Philip Barton Key, Maryland Historical Collection, Portfolio 11, MHS. Hereafter cited as Brooks letter.

[299] Walter Dulany, Jr., to ———, August 11, 1782.

[300] *Political Magazine*, July, 1782, p. 447.

[301] Brooks letter.

[302] *Ibid.*

nate, because I do not wish to imitate, but to punish your insolence. If you harbour still the same degree of resentment, the bearer will put in a way of carrying it into immediate execution.[303]

After this outburst however Allen again became elusive; when Lloyd Dulany, having provided himself with a second in the person of a well-connected fellow loyalist, James Delancy, accompanied Mr. Morris to Allen's house in Islington Spa he was told that the parson had departed for Barking in Essex " where he was likely to remain for some time." [304] Dulany wished to set out at once for Barking but was deterred by the refusal of Mr. Morris to accompany him. It is difficult to judge from the available accounts whether their subsequent meeting was accidental and against the will of Allen or not. Dulany's next move was to write two letters, one of which was left at Allen's house and the other " sent to Illford, to Mr. Bamber Gascoyne's where he then was." [305] That evening Dulany and the two seconds met at Marybone Coffee House and went together to " Mr Fazakerly's in Clifford Street "; as the coach stopped at the door Allen was seen entering the house.[306] The two opponents met and it was decided to settle the issue immediately. Even then there were difficulties to be surmounted; Allen had no balls for his pistols and when these were finally obtained Mr. Morris suggested deferring the affair until the next day but Dulany refused. The four drove to Hyde Park through Grosvenor Gate and entered the Deer Park. The time was between nine and ten in the evening but since it was June it was merely " darkish." [307] It was decided that the opponents should stand eight yards apart.[308] and that the signal for firing

[303] *Ibid.* The bearer was Robert Morris, secretary to the Bill of Rights, *ibid.* According to the rather unreliable recollections of Boucher, Morris like Allen had won the gratitude of Lord Baltimore by writing in his defense at the time of his trial for the rape of Miss Woodcock, Boucher, *Reminiscences*, p. 55. Baltimore apparently did make Morris one of his executors and guardian of his illegitimate children. One of the younger Dulanys wrote his father from London that " Your Suspicions of Morris from his Acquaintance with Allen, were extremely well founded," since he was reported to have made several attempts to marry his ward, Miss Harford, who was not yet thirteen, and not only to have attempted to introduce young Henry Harford, then a student at Eton, " into the worst Debaucheries " but also to be cherishing designs to " make away with him." Daniel Dulany, Jr., to Walter Dulany, July 13, 1772. Dulany Papers, II, 68; same to same, August 29, 1772, Dulany Papers, II, 59.

[304] *Political Magazine*, 1782, p. 447.

[305] *Ibid.* [306] *Ibid.* [307] *Ibid.*, p. 448.

[308] " De Lancey . . . proposed placing them 12 yds asunder—Mr Morris . . . objected & proposed 8 yds to which Mr Dulany readily acquiesced." Brooks letter.

should be the removal of their hats by the seconds. Both men fired simultaneously and Dulany fell, shot through the right lung. Mr. Delancey remarked solicitously, " My dear Lloyd, I hope you are not much hurt," but Dulany replied, " My dear Jemmy, I am afraid I am done for." He was carried from the field to his house in Park Street where he died three days later.[309]

In July of the same year the Reverend Mr. Bennet Allen and Mr. Morris were indicted at the Old Bailey for the wilful murder of Lloyd Dulany.[310] In charging the jury the judge stated the law against duelling " in a strong and express manner " and said that if the jury reached the conclusion that the duel was deliberate the prisoners must be found guilty of murder.[311] The prosecution produced a witness who testified that on the day of the duel Allen had been seen shooting at a mark in a field near Blackfriar's Bridge but Bamber Gascoigne,[312] supported by two ladies, provided him with an alibi for the time in question,[313] Probably the strongest point in favor of the accused was that after the challenge had been sent no real enthusiasm could be said to have been displayed by him for bringing the affair to a conclusion.[314] Morris was acquitted and Allen found guilty of manslaughter only, for which he was sentenced to pay a fine of one shilling and to undergo six months imprisonment in Newgate.[315]

Although scarcely profitable it is interesting to speculate why Allen should suddenly feel it imperative to resent an insult which he had managed to endure for three years with apparent equanimity. The explanation that it was " some intricate family affairs respecting money " which kept him silent seems unconvincing. Was it perhaps that no one had known that it was the Reverend

[309] *Ibid.* One account states that " Mr. Allen and Mr. Morris as they went off, sent for a coach" (*Political Magazine*, 1782, p. 448) but the Dulany version was that "Allen with his second went away immediately though their assistance was required for Mr. Dulany, but a carryage fortunately passing by, he was put in it." Brooks letter.

[310] *Gentlemen's Magazine*, lii (1782), 353.

[311] *Ibid.*

[312] Bamber Gascoyne was a member of Parliament who supported government policy during the Revolution. L. B. Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III* (London, 1929), 2 Vols., I, 134-137, 167, note 1.

[313] *Annual Register*, 1782, pp. 213-214.

[314] " It appearing, however, in the course of the evidence that the prisoners wanted to evade the challenge, and particularly Mr. Morris . . . " (*Gentleman's Magazine*, lii, 353). James Delancey agreed that Morris had wished to defer the duel until the next day (*Annual Register*, 1782, p. 213).

[315] *Ibid.*

Mr. Bennet Allen who had been publicly insulted in the pages of the *Morning Post* and that in 1782 the news was somehow beginning to leak out? Even an 18th century would-be gentleman might resist defending his honor until it was known that it had been assailed. Or may have some unknown episode brought too vividly to his recollection the memory of his sufferings in Maryland which he persisted in attributing to the machinations of the Dulanys? His behaviour subsequent to the sending of the letter accepting the ancient challenge seems to indicate either that the act was the result of a sudden impulse which he later regretted or that he was following out a rather skilfully planned attempt to appear reluctant in order to provide for the eventuality which did occur. But it is improbable that his real motives can ever be known.

Almost nothing is known of the parson's latter days.[316] For a time at least he maintained a tenuous connection with the church;[317] he obviously did a little occasional anonymous writing and was "supposed to have a considerable share in the management of the *Morning Post*[318] which is described as being in the years 1775-1780 "a shameless organ of the king's party" with "an evil reputation as a retailer of coarse social gossip."[319] He continued to be subject to attacks of gout[320] but lived to be at least 77. Maryland tradition would have it that Allen ended his days a destitute drunkard in the streets of London[321] but there is no evidence to indicate that belief in this perhaps suitable end to his career was anything more than wishful thinking.

It is difficult not to allow the more dramatic episodes of Allen's life in America to obscure the fact that for the student of Maryland history in the years immediately preceding the Revolution his sojourn there has real significance. This would be a pity because his comparatively brief career in the Province serves admirably

[316] "Of Allen's later life no account is accessible." D. N. B.

[317] In 1783 he had "no preferment but the Chapel of Great Ilford in Essex, the salary of which does not exceed £20 per Annum, in the presentation of Bamber Gascoigne, Esq^r." Loyalist Transcripts, 35, i, 454.

[318] *Gentleman's Magazine*, lii, 353.

[319] H. R. Fox Bourne, *English Newspapers, Chapters in the History of Journalism* (London, Chatto and Windus, 1887, 2 vols.), I, 220-221.

[320] Allen to Tilghman, March 6, 1800, HSP; Allen to William Adams, August 11, 1814, Goulburn Papers, Clements Library.

[321] Helfenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 29; Rev. Ethan Allen, *Historical Sketches of St. Ann's Parish in Ann Arundel County, Maryland* (Baltimore, 1857), p. 58.

to illustrate and explain several of the factors which made the Revolution inevitable: for instance, the almost impossible position of a conscientious governor attempting to carry out the wishes of a distant and irresponsible proprietor without losing the necessary popular support for his administration of the Province; the growing criticism of the Anglican church as established in Maryland; the friction which was the inevitable result of the arrival of newcomers from England who tended to regard the proud and self-conscious Maryland gentry as uneducated and ill-bred provincials.

THE HISTORIC MULBERRY TREE OF SAINT MARY'S CITY

By William B. Marye

The anonymous author of the well known *A Relation of Maryland*, which came out in the year 1635, informs his readers that, among fruit trees of divers sorts which are to be found "in great abondance" in Maryland, are "Mulberries"; and, in another place, he remarks that this land is "stored" with them.[1] We must remember that the "Relation" was a recruiting pamphlet, which was designed for the benefit of prospective settlers. Whether or not the (to us) insipid fruit of the red mulberry tree was esteemed as an article of human diet three centuries ago we have no means of knowing. Mulberries are still valued as food for hogs and chickens. However, the intention of the author of the "Relation" seems to have been to conjure up the prospect of a silk industry in Lord Baltimore's colony.

A single variety of mulberry tree (*morus rubra*) is indigenous to the eastern United States, from Massachusetts to Florida.[2] According to our experience, mulberry trees of this variety are not often seen growing in the woods of eastern Maryland or in other situations where they are not obviously "volunteers," escaped from cultivation. It would seem that this tree is intolerant of shade. Where, then, in these parts, did it find a congenial home before 1634, or rather, before the wilderness was destroyed and light replaced its darkness? It is our guess that such favorable situations were to be found along the shores of Chesapeake Bay and its estuaries; on the banks of the larger freshwater streams; on cliffs and rocky declivities; in natural meadows, savannas and barrens; in the Indian towns and in Indian old fields.[3]

[1] "A Relation of Maryland," in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, Clayton Colman Hall, editor, pp. 79, 82.

[2] *Manual of the Trees of North America*, by Charles S. Sargent, pp. 302, 303.

[3] The same remarks are applicable to our native red "cedar," which is equally exacting in the matter of sunlight.

This comparative rarity of the wild mulberry tree in Maryland (granted that it is a fact) may have led some persons to suppose that it is an imported variety, not a native. Others, perhaps, were saved from this error, because they had heard tell of the venerable and historic mulberry tree, which stood on Church Point, not far from the bluffs of Saint Mary's River, and within the former limits of Saint Mary's City, on land which was taken up by Governor Calvert in 1641, and which he called " East Saint Mary's " or " The Governor's Field." The spot on which this remarkable tree grew, has been occupied, since 1890, most appropriately, by the Leonard Calvert Monument. It commands a view, which extends all the way to the mouth of the river and to the distant Potomac. It is but a short way from the site of the State House of 1676.[4]

In their *Popular History of the United States*, William Cullen Bryant and Sidney H. Gay, far from ignoring the old mulberry tree, treat the subject with what seems to us a not undue seriousness:

> On the highest part of the bluff [of Saint Mary's River] stood a mulberry tree large enough even then [i. e., in 1634] to throw a broad shade about it, and to be visible for a long distance up and down the river. For more than two hundred years afterwards its mass of foliage still crowned the promontory; and its decayed and blackened trunk, lying where it fell but a few years ago " [i. e., ante 1876] yet marks the place of its growth, but nearer to the edge of the bank than it was when the settlers first stood around it, for the river has changed and reduced the sandy cape. Under this tree, *according to well authenticated tradition*,[5] Leonard Calvert made a treaty with the Indians of the village.[6]

Messrs. Bryant and Gay do not vouchsafe any information as to how this tradition was " authenticated " to their satisfaction; but they acknowledge indebtedness to Dr. John M. Brome (1819-1887), a gentleman of that neighborhood and the then owner of Church Point and of a large estate lying thereabout known as

[4] On his admirable Map of Saint Mary's City, Henry Chandlee Forman, the leading authority on the archaeology of that town, indicates the site of the mulberry tree, now that of the Calvert Monument, in relation to the site of the State House completed in 1676.

[5] The italics used in this article are the author's own.

[6] Vol. I, p. 496. Fortunately for us in the present instance New Englanders have always been great on the subject of historic trees. For a description of the making of the treaty with the Yoacomico Indians see "A Relation of Maryland," in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 73, 74.

"Saint Mary's Manor," who, according to these authorities, "has carefully preserved many local traditions."[7] We are informed that Bryant met Dr. Brome and enjoyed the privilege of talking over such matters with him.[8]

In the *Popular History* there is a realistic drawing of the trunk of the old mulberry tree as it lay prone on the ground in a clump of pines. A somewhat less distressing picture of the tree, made during one of the earlier stages of its disintegration, is attributed to a seminary student, a Miss Piper. It was drawn in the year 1852, and shows the tree already dead, but still *in situ.* A sapling is growing out of the hollow trunk and gives to the all but dismembered carcass a fictitious semblance of life.[9] Through the thoughtfulness of Mrs. J. Spence Howard, this valuable drawing is today one of the treasures of the replica of the State House at Saint Mary's.

Other traditions regarding the mulberry tree, besides that recorded by Bryant and Gay, are not wanting. The historian Thomas, not neglecting to mention the tradition concerning the Indian treaty, tells us furthermore that, according to "traditionary history," it sheltered "the first mass at Saint Mary's."[10] It is also said (but on whose authority we do not know), that a bell was hung in the tree for the purpose of calling members of the Assembly to their meetings.

The fame of Maryland's historic mulberry tree has been celebrated both in verse and in prose.[11] More than one prose writer is so much moved to reverence by his subject, that, when he comes to mention the final end of the grand old tree, he can not bring himself to speak plainly, but must needs resort to an euphemism, which falls little short of saying that it was "laid to rest." The

[7] Bryant and Gay, *op. cit.*, 504.

[8] For this information the author is indebted to Mrs. J. Spence Howard, granddaughter of Dr. Brome.

[9] This illustration, showing the historic tree reduced to a trunk and lying prone, will be found in the *Popular History*, Vol. I, opposite page 496. A photograph of Miss Piper's drawing is the property of the Maryland Room of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Maryland. A reproduction of this drawing was published in the Baltimore *Evening Sun* of August 4, 1934.

[10] James Walter Thomas, *Chronicles of Colonial Maryland* (1913), p. 32. Forman, in his *Jamestown and Saint Mary's* (1938), reasserts the tradition of the mulberry tree as site of the making of the Indian treaty, in 1634, and adds, that the Maryland colonists assembled under this tree to hear the reading of the royal charter and of a statement of Lord Baltimore's intentions regarding the Province.

[11] The poem referred to is the work of Miss Dora Maddox and was published some years ago.

remains of the mulberry tree did not rest, however, but were put to various uses, both sacred and profane:

> Most of the trees was sawed into timber and used in decorating and furnishing the old Trinity Episcopal Church which stood hard by. From the smaller pieces were made numerous crosses, canes, gavels and like emblems that have since found their way to the cabinets of many noted collection of historical souvenirs.[12]

People who have lived to a great age have been known stoutly to maintain to the very end of their days that their lives were shortened by the inconsiderate or cruel acts of others, or by an adverse and unkind Fate. The case of the historic mulberry tree is analogous. For a tree of its species it certainly enjoyed a remarkable longevity, although, in its younger days, despite the respect in which it may have been held, it seems to have been subjected to a sort of ill usage and to have been made use of in a way highly detrimental to its welfare:

> On the mulberry tree, . . . probably then the only large tree on the bluff, were nailed the proclamations of Calvert and his successors, the notices of punishments and fines, the inventories of debtors whose goods were to be sold, and all notices calling for the public attention. Even of late years curious relic hunters have dug from the decaying trunk the rude nails which thus held the forgotten state papers of two centuries ago.[13]

We have seen that Bryant and Gay accept as "well authenticated" the tradition concerning the mulberry tree, that under it Leonard Calvert made a treaty with the Yoacomico Indians in the year 1634. Documentary evidence, which corroborates this tradition, or tends to substantiate it, does not seem to be in existence. Those who are inclined to be more sceptical in these matters than the author are free to believe that it never happened; that the treaty and the tree never met together. However, if any of these last should question the very existence of this tree as early as the seventeenth century, they are in for a change of mind, since it not only existed then, but (or so the record implies) it was a landmark well known to the citizens of Saint Mary's. We owe this

[12] "Maryland's Historic Mulberry Tree," by J. E. Harrison, in *The Patriotic Marylander*, Vol. III (1916-17), p. 94. The Maryland Historical Society owns various articles manufactured from the tree, including a goblet and two canes of considerable interest, one cut in 1836 from the tree by John P. Kennedy and presented by him in 1857, and another with a beautifully carved head intended to represent Governor Leonard Calvert.

[13] Bryant and Gay, I, 504.

information to a deposition of Garrett Van Sweringen, taken before the Lower House on August 29th, 1681, which runs, in part, as follows:

> That on Saturday last in the afternoon *he came by the Mulberry Tree* where he Discoursed with one of the Burgesses about Repairing the house for the Committee to Sitt in.[14]

The death of our historic mulberry tree occurred some time—probably not many years—before 1852. How old was it when it died? Speculation on this point may be based on a tentative acceptance of tradition. *Morus rubra* grows rapidly in its youth. While our mulberry tree must have attained to a certain respectable size and spread by 1634, in order to attract attention and to draw beneath its "shade" (it was not, to be sure, in full leaf) Leonard Calvert, his followers and the Indian natives of the place, bent on making a treaty, it need not have been more than fifty years old, and it may even have been somewhat younger. On this basis we take it upon ourselves to suggest an age, at time of death, of not less than two hundred and fifty years. To those who may object, that no North American mulberry tree ever lived to such an age, we rejoin that the tree was a landmark in 1681, and could not have been much less than fifty years old at that time; therefore, it almost certainly reached an age of two centuries. We imagine it as a mature tree "sixty or seventy feet tall." The variety to which it belonged develops "stout spreading smooth branches," which form "a dense round topped shapely head." This tree rarely exceeds three or four feet in diameter;[15] but Maryland's historical mulberry tree probably bettered these dimensions. It is doubtful, however, if it made any considerable growth in the last decades of its very long life; and it probably lost a part

[14] *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. VII, p. 140. Van Sweringen, who had held office at New Amstel on the Delaware, was a resident of Saint Mary's by 1671. In 1679 he was keeping an inn in that town (*ibid.*, XV, 264). On Feb. 15, 1680/1, the Counil met at his house (*ibid.*, p. 329). He was High Sheriff of Saint Mary's County, 1686-1688. The author has looked elsewhere for an early mention of the mulberry tree, but without success. His thanks are due to Mr. Arthur C. Trader, of the Land Office of Maryland, for examining land records there on file, which relate to "East Saint Mary's," in order to ascertain if by chance they contained any allusion to the tree. This mulberry tree, standing within the bounds of an original survey, was neither a bounded tree nor a line tree. Incidentally, we may add, mulberry trees are very rarely called for in the land records of colonial Maryland, to judge by this author's experience.

[15] We are quoting Sargent's *Manual*.

of its chief glory, its crown, long before it gave up the ghost. Indeed, we wonder that, growing as it did in such an exposed situation, lightning spared its life so long.

Granted, if it may be, that Maryland's best-known mulberry tree was a mature specimen of its kind by the year 1634, it is by no means certain that it began life as a "wild" tree, and that it may not have been closely associated with human life and destiny, in a proprietary way, long before it became involved with the history of Maryland. It is a well known and well authenticated fact, that our first colonists peaceably took possession of, and settled in, an Indian town or village of the Yoacomico Indians. In a letter addressed to his friend, Sir Richard Lechford, and dated May 30, 1634, Governor Leonard Calvert describes the site as he first saw it:

> A most convenient harbour [i. e., of Saint George's or Saint Mary's River] and pleasant Country, lying on each side of it *w^th^ many large* fields of excellent land cleared from all wood.[16]

A contemporary writer on the founding of Maryland tells us how the prospective colonists under Calvert, "cumming thus to seate upon an Indian Towne," "found ground cleered to their hands."[17] Governor Calvert's words are the more important in the present connection, because he implies that those Indian fields were clean of obstructions and seemingly ready for the plough. He appears to indicate that dead trees, girdled by the natives, which characterized those Indian fields which had not been long in existence, were not conspicuous in this case, if they were not wholly absent. It seems to be not unlikely, therefore, that it was a case of an Indian settlement, which had been established in that place for a relatively long time. It is a remarkable fact, that could we but witness that scene as it presented itself to the eyes of Leonard Calvert—his first sight of Saint Mary's River—(unless, indeed, the presence of Indian cabins near shore betrayed its primitive character), we should "recognise" in it the typical Maryland "tidewater" landscape of open fields, intercepted by woods, minus, of course, the rows of bungalows and villas, which are fast destroying the pristine solitude, the antique loneliness, of our Chesapeake shores, effacing their native characteristics and

[16] *Calvert Papers, No. 3* (Fund Publication No. 35) (Baltimore, 1899), p. 21.
[17] This assertion is made by the anonymous author of *A Relation of Maryland*, for which see *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 76.

blotting out all signs and evidence of their appealing, if humble, past.

To return to the point in question, we learn from the writings of William Strachey that, in Virginia, the common sight of corn and tobacco, of beans, pumpkins and squashes, or, as we say here, cymlings, growing in fields or in gardens situated within, or adjacent to, the Indian towns, was not the only sign of the Indian's interest in agriculture and horticulture.

By their dwellings *are some great mulberry trees* and these in some parts of the country are found growing naturally in pretty groves.[18]

The historian, Strachey, appears to imply that those mulberry trees, which were observed by the English in the coastal towns of Virginia, were cherished, or, so to speak, cultivated, by the natives, as contrasted with those which grew " naturally " in those parts of the colony. This impression is strengthened by his use of the adjective " great " in connection with the former.

The same authority testifies to the fact that the Virginia Indians were not blind to the appeal of native trees and shrubs, which, so far as we know, they did not put to any particular use.

By the dwellings of the salvages are *bay-trees, wild roses* and a kind of low tree, which beares a cod like to peas, but nothing so big: we take yt to be a locust.[19]

---

[18] *Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia*, by William Strachey (London, 1849), p. 117. Strachey was Secretary of Virginia in 1610-1611; member of the Council in 1610. In his *Description of Virginia*, Captain John Smith makes the same statement, using the same words (*Narratives of Early Virginia*, Lyon G. Tyler, Editor, p. 90). In his dictionary of the (Virginia Algonkian) Indian language Strachey gives two words for mulberries, viz., muskmuims and paskamath (*Historie*, pp. 191, 192).

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 130. Strachey's editor thinks that "bay-trees" may refer to *laurus caroliniensis*, but why not to the small tree, which, in Maryland, is generally an arborescent shrub, and is popularly known as the sweet bay (*magnolia glauca*)? There is no reason to suppose that the Indian did not find the odor of the blossoms of the sweet bay delectable, even as we do. The locust tree (*robinia pseudacacia*) may have been valued by Indians for its flowers, but it was probably respected most for its usefulness, since its wood was used for making spears. (" Extracts from the Annual Letters of the . . . Society of Jesus," 1642, in *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 138. It is not clear whether the author of this letter is speaking for all the Indians of whom he had any knowledge, or merely of the Susquehannocks). That the Indians actually planted useful and ornamental trees and shrubs in their towns, rather than that they merely spared and cherished these plants where they found them growing naturally within the confines of their settlements, is, with particular reference to mulberry trees, not excluded from the realm of possibility. Writing in 1666, Captain Robert Sandford tells us in his " Relation," that he visited an Indian town in the Carolinas, where he saw " Before the Doore of their State-

What was true of the Indian towns of the "tidewater" region of Virginia was probably true also of Indian villages in "tidewater" Maryland, the natives of which, in language and customs, were, for the most part, almost identical with those of the more southern colony.

Whereas no other tree of that species in Maryland acquired any sort of fame, it is only fair to add (and it may not be without interest), that Baltimore City had its mulberry tree, a native, wild specimen of its kind, which was for many years a landmark and a well-known boundary tree, before houses and streets occupied the neighborhood where it had formerly stood. First bounded in the year 1669, in an utter wilderness, this mulberry tree was alive in 1743, and was still standing *in situ*, though dead, in 1785. Its site lies east of Charles Street, some sixty or seventy feet north of Jones's Falls, within the confines of the Pennsylvania Station yards.[20]

house a spacious walke rowed with trees on both sides, tall and full branched, not much unlike to Elms, which serves for the Exercise and recreation of the men." ("A Relation" by Robert Sandford in *Narratives of Early Carolina*, Alexander S. Salley, Jr., Editor, p. 91.) In this case, it is, of course, barely possible that these Indians had received instructions or suggestions from the Spaniards.

[20] Land Office of Maryland, Patent Records for Land, Liber XII, folio 276: George Hickson's certificate for 200 acres, called "Saint Mary Bourne," surveyed May 20, 1669. The first line of this land runs N. E. and by N., 25 perches, across the "Main Run" of the North West Branch of Patapsco River (i. e., Jones's Falls which was not then as yet so called) "*to a marked mulberry*." "Saint Mary Bourne" was resurveyed, September 25, 1720, for Jonathan Hanson, and called "Mount Royal (Land Office of Maryland, Patented Certificate No. 3407, Baltimore County). The bounded mulberry then became a bounded tree of the resurvey. In the year 1785 Joseph Merryman and Major Thomas Rutter proved this "forked" mulberry tree, then dead, to be a boundary of "Mount Royal" (Baltimore County Land Records, Liber W. G. No. X, folio 155 *et seq.*).

A LIST OF PROMOTIONS IN THE MARYLAND REGULAR TROOPS, 1776

Edited by WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

" Above is two distinct States of the Line of Rank you desire," wrote Brigadier General William Smallwood, commander of the Maryland troops in the Continental Army, to Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, president of the Maryland Council of Safety. The list, purchased recently by the Maryland Historical Society is a valuable addition to the military history of Maryland in the Revolution. It shows the changes in officer personnel made necessary by the casualties suffered in the autumn campaigns of 1776, and it establishes definite dates for eligibility in the promotions.

The battalion of Maryland Regular Troops commanded by General Smallwood [1] had, indeed, undergone rough treatment during the fighting around New York. These were the men who bore the brunt for the American cause in the battles at Brooklyn Heights (Long Island) and White Plains. They sustained the full attack of the enemy and guarded the retreat of Washington's ragged army as it escaped from the trap which might have eliminated it completely and crushed the Revolution early in the struggle. An eyewitness described the action in these terms: " Smallwood's battalion of Marylanders were distinguished in the field by the most intrepid courage, the most regular use of the musket and judicious movements of the body. . . . When our party was over come and broken, by superior numbers surrounding them on all sides, three companies of the *Maryland* broke the enemy's lines and fought their way through." [2]

[1] William Smallwood (1732-92) was commissioned a colonel when the Maryland troops were organized in January, 1776. The Continental Congress did not elect him a brigadier general until October 23, 1776, so that he still held the lower rank at the time of the heavy fighting during the early fall.

[2] Peter Force, *American Archives*, Fifth Series (Washington, 1848), I, 1244.

It was not surprising, therefore, that the loss in dead, wounded, and captured should be large. The listed quoted below shows a loss of five officers at Long Island and two at White Plains, even in this small group of nineteen names. The general reaction was expressed by Colonel Tench Tilghman in a letter to Smallwood: "We lament your loss on Long Island but glory in the honor you have brought to our province and yourself." [3]

A List of First Second Third Lieutenants & Ensigns of the Maryland Regular Troops Who Were Entitled to Brevets Down to the 16th of December 1776

first Lieutenants	*Date as Capt. under Brevt.*
William Sterrett [4]	26th Septr 1776 on Death of Capt. Bowie [5]
John Steward [6]	28th October..... of Bracco [7]
Levin Winder [8]	30th ..... Scott [9]
Archd. Anderson [10]	10th Decemr. resignatn. of Harrison [11]

[3] Tilghman to Smallwood, Annapolis, September 20, 1776. Quoted in Thomas Balch, ed., *Papers Relating Chiefly to the Maryland Line During the Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1857), p. 65.

[4] William Sterrett—1st lt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, November 8, 1776; capt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, April 10, 1777; resigned, December 15, 1777. [All data concerning the military careers of the officers named on the list are taken from Francis B. Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army During the War of the Revolution* (Washington, 1914).]

[5] Daniel Bowie—1st lt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; capt., February 1776; wounded and taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; died in captivity shortly afterward.

[6] John Stewart (d. 1783)—1st lt. of Thomas' Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; capt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, April 17, 1777; taken prisoner at Staten Island, August 22, 1777; lt. col. 1st Maryland, February 10, 1781.

[7] Bennett Bracco—1st lt. of Beall's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; capt. August 16, 1776; killed at White Plains, October 28, 1776.

[8] Levin Winder (1757-1819)—1st lt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; capt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, April 17, 1777; wounded and taken prisoner at Camden, August 16, 1780; exchanged, June 1781; lt. col. 5th Maryland, April 27, 1781.

[9] John Day Scott—capt. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; killed at White Plains, October 28, 1776.

[10] Archibald Anderson—2nd lt. of Hindman'd Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; 1st. lt., September 1776; capt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; major, 3rd Maryland, June 10, 1777; brigade major, June 16, 1778; killed at Guilford, March 15, 1781.

[11] William Harrison—capt., January 14, 1776; wounded at Long Island, August 27, 1776; resigned, and died from wounds in 1777.

second Lieutts.	*Date as 1st. lt. under Brevet*
Dent [12]	26th Septr. 1776
Hindman [13]	28 Octobr. . . . .
Gaither [14]	30 . . . . .
Hudson [15]	10 December . .

Ensigns & 3d. Lieutts.	*Date as second Lts. under Brevet*
Cox [16]	26th Septr. 1776
Thomas Beale [17]	28 Octobr.
Fernandis [18]	30 October
C. Williams [19]	10 December

[*first Lieutenants*]	[*Date as Capt.*]
William Sterrett	26 Septr 1776 . . . .
Halkerston [20]	28 Octobr. D, th Bracco
L. Winder	30- Octobr. D, th Scott
Saml. Wright [21]	10 Decmr. Resign. of Harrison

[12] Probably George Dent (d. 1812)—1st lt. 3rd Maryland Battalion of the Flying Camp, July-December 1776.

[13] Edward Hindman—3rd lt. of Hindman's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; 2nd lt., April 1776; capt. 3rd Maryland, December 10, 1776; resigned, October 15, 1777.

[14] Henry Gaither (1751-1811)—ens. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14, 1776; 1st lt. Maryland Battalion of the Flying Camp, June 8, 1776; 1st lt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; capt., April 17, 1777; brevet major, November 5, 1777.

[15] Hooper Hudson—2nd lt. of Barrett's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; 1st lt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; marked "dead" on roll, December 1777.

[16] Walter Cox—ens. of Smallwood's Maryland Regiment, January 14 to May 1776; capt. of Hartley's Continental Regiment, February 5, 1777; retired, December 1778.

[17] Thomas Beall—2nd lt. of Bracco's Independent Maryland Company, August 27, 1776; 1st lt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; resigned, April 17, 1777.

[18] James Fernandis—ens. of Smallwood's Maryand Regiment, May 1776; taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, March 24, 1777; 2nd lt. 1st Maryland, December 10, 1776; 1st lt., April 17, 1777; capt. lt., March 1, 1778; resigned, July 15, 1779.

[19] Possibly Nathan Williams—ens. Maryland Battalion of the Flying Camp, July to December 1776; 2nd lt. 6th Maryland, December 10, 1776; 1st lt., October 10, 1777; wounded at Monmouth, June 28, 1778; capt. lt., June 1, 1779; killed at Camden, August 16, 1780.

[20] John Halkerstone—2nd lt. of Beall's Independent Maryand Company, January 14, 1776; 1st lt., July 1776.

[21] Samuel Turbutt Wright (1749-1810)—2nd lt. of Veazey's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, April 20, 1778; capt. 2nd Maryland, December 10, 1776; resigned, July 1, 1779.

[*second Lieutts.*]	[*Date as 1st. Lt.*]
Dent	26 September 1776
T. Beale	28 Octobr. . . . .
Gaither	30 O[c]tobr. . . . .
De. Courcey [22]	10 Decemr. . . . .

[*Ensigns & 3d. Lieutts.*]	[*Date as second Lts.*]
Cox	26 September 1776
C: Williams	28 Octobr. . . . .
Fernandis	30 Octobr. . . . .

Sir,

Above is two distinct States of the Line of Rank you require; the first points out the Degrees which ought regularly to have been held under Brevet (upon the first Establishment) by first second third Lieutenants & Ensigns of the Regular Troops, and the latter shows such as the several Independant [*sic*] Officers were entitled to by the Promotion in Companies adopted by the Council of Safety, which having been irregular was one Reason of Brevets not having been granted—and as I am unacquainted with the Promotions, or Rule by which they have been made, can't ascertain whether they hold Rank in either Instance agreeable to what such Brevets might have entitled them, & I am &c

W. Smallwood B. G.

Hble. D. St. T. Jenifer

[22] Edward De Courcey—3rd lt. of Veazey's Independent Maryland Company, January 14, 1776; wounded and taken prisoner at Long Island, August 27, 1776; exchanged, September 27, 1777.

BOOK REVIEWS

Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy. By CHARLES W. RAMSDELL. (The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History.) Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. 136 pp. $2.

General Lee, in his farewell address to the Army of Northern Virginia at Appomattox, told his men that "after four years of unsurpassed courage and fortitude" they were compelled to surrender to "overwhelming numbers and resources."

Dr. Ramsdell reaches the same conclusion in his book, *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, but he goes deeper into the reasons that made it a Lost Cause.

Dr. Ramsdell finds that the cause was lost at home before it was lost at the battlefront. As a result of a lifetime of research and reflective thinking, he suggests that the collapse of the Confederacy was due primarily to three factors—the chaotic financial conditions, the industrial weakness of the South and the breakdown of the South's transportation system.

In answer to the question: Could the South have won? Dr. Ramsdell believes that only a series of miracles could have given it the victory.

Much has been written by historians about the controversies in the Confederacy over State rights. Dr. Ramsdell shows that State governments, and even individual governors, exerted themselves far more loyally in helping the general government than in thwarting it.

Of special interest—although it does not make pleasant reading—is Dr. Ramsdell's story of the open trading in cotton between the North and the South. And he tells us that in the winter of 1864-65, Lee's half-starved men in the trenches before Richmond were fed with bacon from New York exchanged for cotton, which was worth its weight in gold in the North. And that at a time when Grant was losing thousands of men in his efforts to cut off Lee's supplies.

That Lincoln approved of this trading and that it was finally stopped by Grant is the statement of the author.

Dr. Ramsdell's concluding paragraph is well worth quoting:

"Perhaps the Lost Cause was doomed from the beginning of the war, but its gallant and courageous people upheld it until their whole economic and social order disintegrated and collapsed about them. And they went on to the tragic end, aware of what was impending without faltering. For that they will live, with honor, throughout history."

RICHARD D. STEUART

Delaware's Forgotten Folk. By C. A. Weslager. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943. 215 pp. $2.50.

Probably few Marylanders have heard of the We-Sorts, yet this is the name applied to several hundred people of mixed white, Indian and, in some instances with an admixture of Negro blood, who live apart from their neighbours in Charles and Prince George counties. Mr. Weslager in his book treats of people having similar racial blends who live in Delaware. As the author points out, there are two distinct settlements of such people living in Delaware, one group living on the Indian River not far from Millsboro, and the other group at Cheswold, near Dover. The people living near Millsboro are descendants of the Nanticoke Indians: the others are descendants of various Indian tribes.

Of the two settlements, those living on the Indian River place greater emphasis on their mixed white and Indian blood. This group has sought to secure from the State of Delaware recognition of this fact by securing separate schools for their children and other legal rights. They have objected to having their children educated in schools attended only by Negroes. In their struggle for recognition, Mr. Frank G. Speck, a professor of anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, championed their cause.

While Mr. Speck spent much time in visiting the Indian River settlement, Mr. Weslager has confined his investigations to the group living near Dover. Both men have been impressed with the characteristics of these mixed blood people. Of interest to them have been the traditions handed down from one generation to another, their folklore, and the mysticism once prevalent among their Indian ancestors. As an example of the latter is their belief in dreams. When the author was visiting a family having Indian and white blood, the husband told him that it was a very bad omen to dream of a snake three nights in succession. "It means," said the man, "that someone who don't like you will presently fault you. The onliest way to keep him for faultin' you is to go out next day and kill a snake. That will break the spell."

Mr. Weslager gives examples of their use of herbs as drugs, and also of their folklore, such as the belief that a ringing in your ears, or "death bells," means that a friend or relative will shortly die, and, if a dog comes to your door and howls, that is a sure sign of the death of a member of the family.

The book is illustrated with some photographs of the people living in Delaware who are of mixed Indian and white blood. Features characteristic of their aboriginal forbears are easily discernible.

The author modestly says that much remains to be written about these mixed blood people. While this may be so, it is also true that Mr. Weslager has told what he has found out about them in an instructive and interesting manner. Perhaps he may be persuaded to extend his investigations to the We-Sorts of southern Maryland.

Raphael Semmes

Leaves from an Old Washington Diary, 1854-1863. By ELIZABETH LINDSAY LOMAX. Edited by LINDSAY LOMAX WOOD. New York: Dutton, 1943. 256 pp. $2.50.

The general run of diaries is either boring or scandalous. This one is neither, but with the aid of discriminating editorship, manages even in the brief entries, to win the reader's interest in and sympathy with the author. Here is a self portrait of an extremely intelligent, sincere and courageous woman, a devoted mother and a skilful diplomat. At sixteen, Mrs. Lomax married Major Mann Page Lomax, U. S. A. After several years at Newport, where her husband was stationed, and where she made the many warm friends who were later to be of such help to her, her husband died. As the diary opens in 1854, thrown upon her own resources, she had settled in Washington with her six children, five daughters and one son. The boy secured an appointment to West Point; the girls immediately became very popular and were invited to many balls and levees.

In addition to having a quick wit and kind sense of humor—she declared that wit at the expense of someone else was merely scoffing—Mrs. Lomax was a deeply religious woman, and highly gifted musically on both harp and piano.

Through those uncertain pre-war years, she met and entertained many people. Col. R. E. Lee, then Superintendent at West Point, told her not to worry about her son, a " very promising young man." Hers was truly an " open house," and if it had not been for her pension, secretarial work copying records first under President Pierce and then for President Buchanan, for the State Department and later for the War Department, she would have been in very straightened circumstances. Her son also sent her the major part of his salary.

Mrs. Lomax was a person of decided opinions. In 1858 she approved of equal education for both men and women. " Every woman should be fitted to be a mental companion for her husband and sons, though I still believe that the duties of men and women should be different." She had a mind capable of grasping the implications of the times. She was interested in the laying of the Atlantic Cable. She foresaw the tragic outcome of Harper's Ferry. Her heart was torn between her belief in the Union, and the attack upon her homeland, Virginia. Her up-to-date daughters bought a sewing machine and had instructions as to its use. In twelve days, Mrs. Lomax was making shirts for her beloved son. " Once in a while I become too enthusiastic; pedal too fast, and it runs away with me, but I shall soon learn to *adapt myself* to the *machine*. What a thought! "

Upon the election of Abraham Lincoln, chaos in Washington redoubled. Mrs. Lomax wrote: " I am after much thought and deliberation, *definitely for the Union with some amendments to the* Constitution." Despite her emotional feelings, she was invited and present at the entertainment of the first Japanese diplomats. She did not like the Japs.

Division among families wrung her heart. When the War actually came, she called it fratricide, even though she continued her friendships with those on the Northern side as well as those on the Southern. Her son resigned his commission in the U. S. Army, in a letter which strongly indicated his impartiality—the letter is on record at the War Department as characteristic of the spirit of the times.

The *Baltimore Sun* reached Mrs. Lomax frequently, and she was intensely interested in the news of the Baltimore riots. Alarmed friends advised her to move to Charlottesville, and sending part of her family to Norfolk, she finally complied. Letters from her daughters in Norfolk were ultimately received by Mrs. Lomax in Charlottesville, via Memphis.

During the next year Mrs. Lomax moved to Fredericksburg, then to Baltimore, as expediency and her own conscience demanded. Her pension had been stopped, her copying, of course, was no longer allowed, and her proud spirit revolted at the thought that she was an extra burden upon relatives and friends whose resources were almost exhausted. In September, 1862, she ventured a short trip to her lovely home in Washington. She was there when Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation, with which she heartily agreed.

Mrs. Lomax's stay in Washington was brief. Lincoln had decreed that the homes of all Southern sympathizers would be subject to confiscation. She returned to Baltimore, but she felt the urge to be where news came in most quickly and most reliably. What a reporter she would have made! Through her friendship with Federal officers she was able almost at will, to pass not only herself and her friends, but even part of her family through the Federal lines.

This is a book which should be read by any historically-minded person in either Maryland or Virginia. Familiar names appear on almost every page: Garretts, Bucklers, Randolphs, Cabells, Lees and Carmichaels—until this reviewer was positive that her own forebears might pop up at any moment. Deep below the surface record of gay evenings spent in dancing to harp, violin and piano, lies the indomitable spirit of the author—devout, devoted, brave, sincere and loyal. The diary ends with the imprisonment of three of her daughters as "Southern sympathizers." Illness overcame her stout heart—she could write no more.

In the Supplement, Epilogue and Appendices may be found the answers to the questions to which many may seek a reply. The book is delightful reading. The interest, despite the brevity of the entries, is that of a well rounded story, with a background of War, through which the personality of Elizabeth Lomax shines—radiant, wise and loyal—a truly remarkable woman.

PENELOPE W. JAMISON

Mirror for Americans: Likeness of the Eastern Seaboard, 1810. By Ralph H. Brown. New York: American Geographical Society, 1943. xxxii, 312 pp. $4.00.

Professor Brown's " concise geographical view of the inhabited parts of eastern America " boasts a Preface, an Introduction, and a Prologue, all of which are required reading. Required, because they explain the creation of the fictitious American geographer, Thomas Pownall Keystone, author of *Mirror for Americans*.

At the close of the eighteenth century and in the very early days of the nineteenth, an exciting and even sensational political experiment was being conducted in North America. Scholarly, cultivated, and curious Europeans were eager to study the country in which an intriguing experiment in democracy was being carried on. European investigators and travelers wrote copiously, if sometimes inaccurately, on the nature and appearance of the new republic. And native historians and geographers responded with on-the-spot reporting. The geography of the United States became a subject of great interest and much spirited controversy.

Special evidence of this interest in the new country is the library of several thousand books, pamphlets, articles, manuscripts, and maps relating to America which was collected, probably before 1816, by a German scholar, Christophe Daniel Ebeling. Between 1793 and 1816, Ebeling (whose collection was eventually acquired by the Harvard College Library), with characteristic thoroughness, produced seven volumes of his own on the subject: *Erdbeschreibung und Geschichte von Amerika. Die Vereinten Staaten von Nordamerika.*

Professor Brown, disturbed by the fact that apparently no native American counterpart of Ebeling had existed, found it necessary to create one, Thomas Pownall Keystone. Keystone, according to his inventor, was a native of Philadelphia, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, and the owner of a library rivaling Ebeling's in completeness. Concentrating on geography and disregarding history, Keystone, having access to even more original source material than Ebeling, produced an authoritative and at the same time lively account of the Eastern Seaboard, " embellished with illustrations and maps." Keystone's description of America-on-the-Atlantic includes notes on the physical geography of the country, on the population, on modes of travel, on the occupations of the inhabitants, on maritime affairs, and detailed comment on the various sections of Eastern America from the St. Lawrence to " the Carolina Low Country."

In the chapter devoted to the Chesapeake Country it is noted that " The settled parts of the Bay country are best seen from the waterways, not from the crossroads, for this land is a kind of Venice and by no means a little one. It may at first be doubted that there are not less than two thousand miles of land fronting tidewater in Maryland and Virginia."

Of Baltimore, " Her harbor is more ample than that of Annapolis and though farther inland its water is said to contain a higher proportion of

salt inimical to the growths that honeycomb the hulks of vessels. The city stands at the head of Patapsco Bay, eighteen miles northwest from its entrance to the Chesapeake. The upper part of Patapsco Bay, called the Harbor, is connected with the outer bay at Whetstone Point, about two miles below the city, by a narrow strait scarcely a pistol shot across, which is defended by Fort McHenry. Large vessels go up to Fell's Point, which projects from the east side, but only small boats can approach the other parts of the shore. The city is divided by a creek into two parts, of which the eastern and smallest is Old Town."

Chosen for reproduction in the book is the "East View of Baltimore" (prints of which are in several Baltimore collections), a view noteworthy for the large trees in the foreground and the very sketchy panorama of the city in the distance, but drawn by G. Beck, Philadelphia.

Professor Brown has done a brilliant job in creating such an entertaining and well-informed amateur geographer as Thomas P. Keystone and in so carefully editing and documenting Keystone's work. The bibliography, by the way, is quite consistently called: "A Selection of Titles from the Library of Thomas Pownall Keystone."

RICHARD CARL MEDFORD

Baltimore Municipal Museum.

Jefferson and the Press. By FRANK L. MOTT. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. 65 pp. $1.00.

In a letter written in 1787 Thomas Jefferson said: ". . . were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter." Again in 1786 he wrote to a friend: "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost." Finally, three years before his death he wrote to Lafayette: "But the only security of all, is in a free press."

No one was ever put to a more severe test by the free press than was Jefferson. He was a constant object of abuse and slander from most of the Federalist editors who turned liberty into license. James Callender, a writer, was the author of a false charge against Jefferson's morals which has survived to this day. At last, stung by repeated attacks, Jefferson abandoned his principle so much as to say: "Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle." But, as his letter to Lafayette indicates, that was a passing fit of cynicism which is not surprising considering what he had endured. Dr. Mott endeavors to explain that, in spite of occasional evidences to the contrary, Jefferson was on the whole consistent in his belief in the freedom of the press.

F. F. BEIRNE

The Plain People of the Confederacy. By Bell Irvin Wiley. [The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History, Louisiana State University, 1943.] Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. ix, 104 pp. $1.50.

One hears so much about the glory and the romance of the South that it is interesting to read a book about the common people who "constituted the bone and sinew of the Southern Confederacy." Apparently, there was nothing grand and glorious about the reactions of the plain folk, white and black, to the impact of the sectional conflict.

There are three essays, one on each of the groups which together composed the overwhelming majority of the population in the region which paid allegiance to Jeff. Davis' government: the common soldiers, the civilians at home, and the colored folk. Each essay describes in some detail the phases of life during the war, and there are numerous quotations from letters and diaries to support the points made.

It appears, for instance, that the common soldier behaved very much as he has done in every war. He stole and plundered during the infrequent sorties into enemy territory, he resorted to wine and women in the effort to show that he was free from home restraints, he deserted to the tune of more than a hundred thousand, and he was often cowardly at crucial moments. The folk at home indulged in red tape and profiteering quite as much as anywhere else, there were many instances of extreme deprivation and of loss of homes, and moral deterioration and crime increased to a marked extent. The Negroes in sections invaded by the Federals ran away in droves, and even trusted house servants in more remote sections took part in minor insubordinations.

This slender volume is stimulating and refreshing. It does not go after the subject in a debunking manner; it simply states the facts from the records. It will not please some patriotic organizations, but it is the sort of truth which helps one to obtain a balanced point of view on a matter which continues controversial after eighty years.

William D. Hoyt, Jr.

Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies. By Mary Patterson Clarke. (Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, XLIV.) New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943. 303 pp. $3.00.

Dr. Clarke's study of parliamentary privilege, in an earlier form, was accepted by Yale University as her doctor's dissertation. That says a great deal in its favor. The research on which it was based was carried on in several libraries in the United States, and, during one summer, in London. As far as the colonies are concerned, the main source was the colonial journals.

The book begins, properly, with a chapter on the privilege in Great

Britain, since all the colonies began as British colonies or soon became British. From there on, each chapter treats one particular topic from Massachusetts to Georgia, and not the whole question of privilege in one colony: the treatment is thus horizontal, not vertical. The position of the Speaker as the embodiment of the Lower House, and the control of the House over the election of its own members, over the members themselves, once they are elected, and over such acts by outsiders as occur in its presence, these topics make up the remainder of the book. There is a lengthy bibliographical chapter, and it is on that point that objections occur to a Marylander. Dr. Clarke made no use of any material in Maryland at all, either in Baltimore, or in Annapolis, and no use of anything at the Library of Congress. Of course no account of the situation in this province could be done without the printed *Archives* and *Bacon's Laws*. But it does not seem that an adequate account could be written with those sources only, and they are the sole ones mentioned by the author.

One point Dr. Clarke makes about Maryland cannot be accepted without a mild protest. She says (p. 161) that the idea of excluding ministers from sitting in the Lower House " was, of course, derived from England." Had she read more Maryland colonial history, she would almost surely omit the " of course," and she might even change her opinion that English experience was the only source of the prohibition. The prohibition, by the way, still stands.

ELIZABETH MERRITT

The Providence Oath of Allegiance and its Signers, 1651-2. By RICHARD LEBARON BOWEN. Providence: Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Rhode Island, 1943. 92 pp.

This little book focuses a search-light on a bit of early Rhode Island history hitherto neglected. Fifteen years after the first settlement by Roger Williams of the Town of Providence, twelve younger leaders in the Colony signed an oath of allegiance to the " Commonwealth of England " to enable their appointed agent to regain from the mother land his charter for the Providence Plantations. Mr. Bowen gives biographical sketches of each signer and shows the weight they exerted in holding together the remnants of the Colony in these crucial years.

The author presupposes a knowledge of Rhode Island history but presents in a scholarly manner new data and detail on this incident in the long and colorful story of that State.

ROSAMOND R. BEIRNE

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

International Bearings of American Policy. By ALBERT SHAW. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. 492 pp. $3.50. Gift of publisher.

The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson. By WILLIAM DIAMOND. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. 210 pp. $2.50 (Paper $2.00). Gift of publisher.

Force and Freedom: Reflections on History. By JACOB BURCKHARDT. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS NICHOLS. New York: Pantheon Books, 1943. 382 pp. Gift of Consul General of Switzerland.

Edgar Allan Poe's Contributions to Alexander's Weekly Messenger. By CLARENCE S. BRIGHAM. (Reprinted from the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society.) Worcester, Mass.: the Society, 1943. 83 pp. Gift of author.

"I Have Tried to Think and Other Papers." By ANNA MELISSA GRAVES. Baltimore: Author, 1943. 81 pp. Gift of author.

The Chapman Family; A Study in the Social Development of Central West Virginia. By BERLIN B. CHAPMAN. Tulsa, Okla.: Mid-West Printing Co., 1943. 290 pp. $2.25. Gift of publisher.

The Family of Bray Wilkins, "Patriarch of Will's Hill," of Salem (Middleton) Mass. By WILLIAM CARROLL HILL. Milford, N. H.: Cabinet Press, 1943. 213 pp. $3. Gift of author.

The Early History of the Stricklands of Sizergh. By S. LEE WASHINGTON. (Reprinted from the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register.*) Boston: Rumford Press, 1943. 100 pp. Gift of author.

NOTES AND QUERIES

MARYLAND BOOKPLATES

As a matter of record, I am compiling a Check List of early Maryland bookplates, prior to 1830, with some data about their owners, and have seen or seen mentioned, a number of plates attributed to Maryland, the owners of which I have been unable to locate. I will appreciate very much any information—birth and death dates—about the following:

Rowland Robinson Crocker, engraved label with wreath
Su: Duke, 1780, printed label
John Fisher, armorial, no motto
Henry Guinand, circa 1775, armorial, motto: *Sans venin*
Thomas Leland, circa 1810, armorial, motto: *Demur*

Can any one furnish information about "Daniel Carroll—Mount Dillon"? His very rare bookplate, *circa* 1730, shows the arms of the Carroll family of Maryland and bears the motto, *In bello e*[?] *in fido fortes.* Where was Mount Dillon and which of the many Daniel Carrolls of Maryand lived there?

I lack information—birth and death dates— about the owners of the following bookplates, all definitely of Maryland. Can any reader help me?

Thomas Bond, Judge of the Orphan's Court, St. Mary's Co. Bookplate by T. Sparrow, of Annapolis.
Thomas M. Brady, Baltimore
John de Butts, Judge of the Orphan's Court, St. Mary's Co.
Philemon St. John Downes, Easton
Alexander Frazier, 1784, bookplate by Thomas Sparrow of Annapolis
Henry H. Gaither, Hagers-town

George Hanson, Md., 1750
T. Munroe, Annapolis (in ink, 1822)
Rev. Levi Stork (of Talbot Co., married Anne G. Nicholson in 1834)
Gulielmi G. Stuart
Dr. Arthur Woolford, Baltimore, April 12, 1797

EDITH G. BEVAN (MRS. WILLIAM F.)
Ruxton, Md.

Who was the father of Anthony Law who died Feb. 21, 1831, in Baltimore? He married Catherine Bausman nee Shryer at the First Presbyterian Church here on Dec. 3, 1799.

Who was the father of Hannah Thompson who married John Rowe in 1790 in the London Grove Meeting of Chester Co., Penna., and married secondly James Gibson?

Who was the father of Gloria Ann Linn who on Jan. 21, 1753, married Baltzer Sumwalt at York, Penna.?

Reply to Editor, *Maryland Historical Magazine.*

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

SAMUEL K. DENNIS, Chief Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City since 1928, is a native of Worcester County, a former Vice President of the Society, and now one of its two Honorary Members. ☆ Formerly resident in Baltimore while a member of the Pratt Library staff, STUART C. SHERMAN recently returned to his native Providence, Rhode Island, where he is supervisor of branches in the Public Library. ☆ REINHARD H. LUTHIN, a native of New York City is a member of the history faculty of Columbia University. He was formerly University Fellow in History at Duke University. With Dean Harry J. Carman, of Columbia College, he is author of *Lincoln and the Patronage* (Columbia University Press, 1943) and is now finishing a volume on Lincoln's rise to the Presidency. ☆ A graduate of Bryn Mawr College, Miss Josephine Fisher is doing civilian work for the Navy Department. ☆ William B. Marye, Corresponding Secretary of the Society since 1937, is widely known for his studies of Indians of the Chesapeake region and other special phases of local history. ☆ As heretofore mentioned in these pages, WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR., is a member of the Society's staff and editor of its news bulletin, *Maryland History Notes.*

The Annual Reports of the Committees of the Society, formerly printed in the *Magazine*, will hereafter appear with the List of Members as a pamphlet to be published in April of each year.

Volume XXXIX Number 2

The Maryland Historical Magazine

1844 1944

JUNE · 1944

Vignettes of Maryland History: Part I
Raphael Semmes 95

Letters of Severn Teackle Wallis, 1816-1894
Frederick Dent Scott 127

Madame Grelaud's French School *Lucy Leigh Bowie* 141

Politics in Maryland during the Civil War (*continued*)
Charles Branch Clark 149

An Account of the John Brown Raid . . . 162

Book Reviews: Chesney, *The Johns Hopkins University and the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine*, reviewed by Charles R. Austrian; Adams, *Album of American History*, by J. Montgomery Gambrill; Dickson, *Observations on American Art . . . Writings of John Neal*, by Edward S. King; *Archives of Maryland, Vol. LIX*, by Josephine Fisher; Hill, *Chesapeake Cruise*, by R. C. Medford; Geiger, *Daniel Carroll, A Framer of the Constitution*, by W. D. Hoyt, Jr., etc. 164

Notes and Queries 175

Published Quarterly by the
MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
BALTIMORE

$3.00 the Year Single copy 75 c.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

BOOKBINDING

FRANK W. LINNEMANN
125 W. Mulberry St. • MU 0197
Magazines, medical books, Old books rebound

BOOKS — NEW AND USED: BOUGHT AND SOLD

SMITH'S BOOK STORE 805 NORTH HOWARD STREET
Established 1876

PHOTOGRAPHY

THE HUGHES COMPANY
J. W. Scott
213 West Monument Street, Baltimore

PHOTOSTATS & BLUEPRINTS

Baltimore Photo & Blue Print Co.
HEARST TOWER BUILDING
Photo copying of old records, genealogical charts and family papers. Enlargements. Coats of Arms. LE 6881

PLUMBING — HEATING

M. NELSON BARNES
Established 1909 Vernon 1646 807 N. Howard St.

STATIONERY, PRINTING & ENGRAVING

JOHN H. SAUMENIG & CO. 229 Park Ave. • Baltimore
Lewis R. Curlett Newton R. Haen

GENEALOGICAL CHARTS



Denby Chart Blanks—A blank form for listing ancestry

Sizes and Prices

Chart		each
16" x 32"	@	$1.00
28" x 44"	@	1.50
28" x 44"	@	2.25
28" x 44"	@	3.50
27" x 40"	@	4.00

Broadside *"America"* in Denby Type
25" x 34" $3.00 each

BOOKS

LINCOLNIANA
The Publication of the Year
Various Display Prints in Denby Types—Synopsis Charts
Memorial Charts: Washington, Lincoln
School Edition ..... $2.75 each
Special Edition ..... 3.50 each
DeLuxe Edition ..... 4.50 each

VICTOR HUGO
FRANCE and Present Day Events
Poems and Translations
Price: in scroll form $3.00
Bound 10" x 19" 5.00

CATALOG NO. 3 OF DENBY TYPES
Contains, besides data on Type, Two Synopsis charts, The Denby and Hooper Achievements and the Large chart filled for Denby Genealogy
20 Crests from Denby pedigrees
Price: (paper cover) $4.00 each

WATER COLOR CATALOG
And Two Supplements
Price: (paper cover) $ 3.00 each copy
3 copies bound 10.00 together

THE COQ D'OR PRESS, 333 FOURTH AVE., NEW YORK 10

SIXTY-THREE YEARS

of dependable service

to the people of

Baltimore and vicinity

MONUMENTAL

STORAGE AND CARPET CLEANING CO.

SPECIAL VAULTS FOR ART OBJECTS AND SILVER: MOVING, PACKING, SHIPPING, FUMIGATING, RUG CLEANING, REPAIRING, LAYING

1110-1116 PARK AVENUE ' ' ' BALTIMORE, MD.

TELEPHONE SARATOGA 3480

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Buildings
201 W. MONUMENT STREET
BALTIMORE

OFFICERS: *President,* George L. Radcliffe; *Vice-Presidents,* J. Hall Pleasants, Laurence Hall Fowler, J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul; *Corresponding Secretary,* William B. Marye; *Recording Secretary,* W. Hall Harris, Jr.; *Treasurer,* Heyward E. Boyce; *Director,* James W. Foster.

THE COUNCIL: The General Officers and Representatives of standing committees—*Trustees of the Athenaeum,* G. Corner Fenhagen; *Publications,* Raphael Semmes; *Library,* L. H. Dielman; *Finance,* Charles E. Rieman; *Membership,* Mrs. Francis F. Beirne; *Addresses,* B. Howell Griswold, Jr.; *Gallery,* John H. Scarff.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION: *Chairman,* Raphael Semmes; J. Hall Pleasants, Henry D. Harlan; *Editor,* James W. Foster.

The Maryland Historical Society, incorporated in 1844, has been engaged in collecting, preserving and disseminating information relating to the history of the State. Through its services to scholars and others in making available collections of research materials, and through its publications, the Society has occupied and always should occupy an important place in the cultural life of Maryland.

Since 1906 the Society has published *The Maryland Historical Magazine.* There are monthly meetings from October to May, inclusive, at which addresses of a historical or literary nature are given. Those interested in the objects of the Society are invited to have their names proposed for membership. The annual dues are $5.00, life membership $100.00. Subscription to *The Maryland Historical Magazine* and to the quarterly news bulletin, *Maryland History Notes,* is included in the membership fee of five dollars, as well as the use of the Society's collections and admission to the monthly lectures. The library, portrait gallery and museum rooms, are open on every day of the week except Sundays.

The Society depends on the people of Maryland and its friends elsewhere for its maintenance. The gift of documents and books and donations or bequests to the endowment fund, have made it possible to build up a notable historical library. The collections include not only manuscripts dealing with the social, political and military history of the State, but also letters, diaries, business accounts, maps, newspapers, pamphlets, prints and photographs. Only by a continuance of interest in the Society will it be possible to preserve and catalogue its present collections and, of equal importance, to acquire new documents recording the rich history of the people of Maryland. In short, the usefulness of the Maryland Historical Society depends not only upon the number of its members, but upon their generosity as well.

The Magazine is entered as second class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under Act of August 24, 1912.

THE HUMBLE

ADDRESS

OF

Tobias Bond, and *Benjamin Welch*,

FLYING MERCURIES, OR NEWS-BOYS,

(*Vulgarly* ſtyled PRINTER'S DEVILS)

TO THE WORTHY CUSTOMERS OF THE

MARYLAND JOURNAL, and BALTIMORE ADVERTISER.

JANUARY 1, 1780.

LET feſtive Mirth once more appear,
And ſmile upon the new-born Year;
May Pleaſure reign without Controul,
Around the cheerful flowing Bowl!
So ſays poor BEN---and TOBY too,
Who, if they have a *Joy* in View,
Derive their flatt'ring HOPES from YOU.
And ſure GOOD NATURE will agree,
There is ſome Reaſon in their Plea;
Remember, Sirs, thro' Froſt and Snow,
We bring you Tidings of the Foe;
The *earlieſt* NEWS from *France* and *Spain*,
And what's tranſacting on the Main;
Shew what all *Europe* are about,
Among the GREAT---who's IN or OUT;
Who has this Place---or that Command---
Of Battles fought by Sea or Land.
Whilſt at your Tea, or Coffee ſeated,
Cur'oſity is amply treated,
With all the Secrets of the Court,
Veſſels arriv'd at ſuch a Port---
Of *Wives* from *Huſbands* run away,
And *horned Cattle* gone aſtray;
Of *Paper Warriors* who ſmother
The Cauſe of Quarrel with each other;---
Or when the *mighty* Matter's told,
Like vulgar Oyſter-Women ſcold!
Let this ſuffice---You ſee our Drift,
Is to requeſt a NEW-YEAR'S GIFT:---
Aſſiſt to raiſe our humble FEAST,
You'll have this *merry Thought* at leaſt,
That by a *Triſle* of your Treaſure,
You give the very *Devils** Pleaſure.
Excuſe theſe Lines, moſt worthy Maſters,
In Truth we are but *Poetaſters*;
Laugh at the Verſe---which we preſent,
But *pay* for laughing---we're *content*.

* That comick Genius TOM WESTON, aſſuming *our Character*, plead ſo ſucceſsfully, on a diſtant Theatre, that the generous Audience not only encouraged the dramatick Bard he recommended, but alſo "gave the *Devil* his Due." He concluded his Prologue thus:

Faith, Sirs, you ſhou'd have ſome Conſideration,
When ev'n the *Devil* pleads againſt *Damnation*.

Prologue to the FASHIONABLE LOVER.

NEWSBOYS' ADDRESS

From the Society's Collection of Broadsides.

MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXIX JUNE, 1944 No. 2

VIGNETTES OF MARYLAND HISTORY

FROM THE SOCIETY'S COLLECTION OF BROADSIDES

By RAPHAEL SEMMES

PART I. TOPICAL

The Society's collection of broadsides falls into two classes, those dealing with a certain subject, or topic, such as the agricultural and industrial development of the state, duelling and the code of honor, or transportation. These will be considered in this article. A second article will treat of political and military broadsides. A broadside, or handbill, usually implies a single sheet of paper printed on one side only. As, however, some of the most interesting sheets in the Society's collection are printed on both sides, these, too, will be considered as broadsides.

There are a number of broadsides, or handbills, in the collection which are of comparatively recent date, but in these two articles, with one or two exceptions, none printed after the end of the Civil War period will be discussed. Thereafter broadsides were no longer an important medium for disseminating information. One other limitation is observed. As the period considered covers nearly two hundred and fifty years, the two articles must of necessity be confined to a description of the broadsides, or handbills themselves, with scant references to the historical background. First to consider those broadsides relating to topics or subjects.

AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Agriculture

Broadsides describing the sales of land form a large part of the Society's collection. The oldest broadside (1769) gives the "Conditions of Sale of the Right Honourable Lord Baltimore's Manors & Reserved Lands." While they do not deal with the sale of lands, there are two broadsides for the year 1784 signed by Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Intendant of the Revenue, which give a summary and a comparative view of the assessment of lands in the counties of Maryland for the years 1781, 1782 and 1783.[1]

One of the most interesting items dealing with agriculture is an early broadside, or handbill, containing a notice of an "Exhibition and Fair, under the direction of the Maryland Agricultural Society," to be held at the Maryland Tavern during the last two days of May, 1822. Charles Ridgely, of Hampton, was Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements. Among others who served on this committee were Henry Thompson, William Patterson, Lloyd N. Rogers, and John E. Howard, Jr. The handbill states the regulations governing the exhibition and warns that "the committee will make every endeavour to put down all gambling, rioting and unlawful proceedings. . . ."

[1] There is also a handbill (May, 1796) giving notice that the Commissioners of the Tax for Baltimore County would hold a meeting soon "for the purpose of hearing appeals, and making transfers. . . ."

The following handbills give notice of the forthcoming sale of land: Confiscated land for sale in four counties. Notice signed by Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Intendant of the Revenue. July 11, 1785 (photostat); 400 acres in Baltimore county, owner, John Gilliss, July 13, 1795; 200 acres in Harford county, owner, Lloyd Durham, July 19, 1802; 100 acres chestnut timber land in Baltimore county, owner Hamlet Gilliss, Mar. 19, 1816; 3001 acres in Frederick county, owner, C. Birnie, circa 1819 (Two broadsides describe this land which are similar but not the same. One mentions a new town to be called "Belfast."); 236 acres in Baltimore county, owner, Jeremiah Ducker, Sept. 8, 1829; Trustee's sale, 256 acres of land of a tract called "My Lady's Manor," trustee, P. H. Rutledge, Mar. 27, 1867.

There are other items regarding land sales. One is entitled "A Caution to Purchasers." It is signed by two men who acted as "attornies in fact" for the heirs of William Wood, deceased. Dated June 1, 1818, it warns would-be-purchasers of certain land on the north side of Baltimore Street to which, they maintained, they alone had title; there is also a broadside which contains a deed of cession of certain land on the west side of Jones' Falls by Samuel and Thomas Chase to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore. It is dated August 13, 1818.

There is one handbill, dated Dec. 24, 1853, printed in Liberty Town, in which Thomas Carr, constable, gives notice of the sale of tobacco by virtue of a distraint warrant.

Two broadsides, both published in 1824, relate to the Eastern Shore. One is entitled "A Brief Extract from the Proceedings of the Trustees of the Board of Agriculture for the Eastern Shore." This board had been organized by the Maryland Agricultural Society. The resolutions and report of the Eastern Shore society, accompanied by a printed form letter dated July 19, 1824, were sent to the farmers in the several counties of the Eastern Shore with the hope that they would form associations of from five to twelve members in order to aid the Maryland Agricultural Society in the improvement of farm lands on the Eastern Shore. Robert H. Goldsborough, Henry Holliday, Daniel Martin, Governor Samuel Stevens, Jr., and Tench Tilghman were the members of a committee who were active in promoting this affair. It is interesting to note that these men considered Negro slavery "an evil for the continuance of which we are not responsible until we can do it away properly and prudently." And this was in 1824!

Another item which the Society possesses is a notice of a "General Agricultural and Horticultural Establishment: comprising a seed and implement store, a general agricultural agency, and the Office of the American Farmer." All these, it appears, were located in the basement of Barnum's Hotel, in Baltimore, in connection with a stock and experimental farm, and a garden and nursery in the vicinity. The notice, printed in 1832 and again in 1833, gives the prices at which garden seeds could be bought.

Industry

A broadside, dated Sept. 1808, of the old "Baltimore Water Company," gives the conditions under which water would be supplied to a family applying for the same. Another, dated June 1, 1818, certifies that Wm. W. Taylor having paid the "Gas Light Company of Baltimore" the sum of one hundred dollars was entitled to one share of the capital stock of that company. Of interest, too, on the subject of industrial development, is a handbill printed in Baltimore in February, 1802, entitled "Rules to be observed by the Hands Employed in the Brick-Making Business. . . ." The duties of the moulder, the temperer, the wheeler and the off-bearer are given in detail.[2]

[2] The Society also has a bill rendered in Oct., 1816, by the Superintendent of Water Works for 174 ft. of pipe, etc., supplied at 50 cents a foot. Other items related to industrial development include a broadside dated Sept. 1, 1827, contain-

BOOKS, LIBRARIES AND NEWSPAPERS

Books

A handbill printed by Wm. Wooddy in March, 1839, throws light on the reading tastes of Baltimoreans of this period. The bookseller was Nathaniel Hickman. Among the books advertised for sale were Scott's prose and poetical works, Lamb's prose works, *Gil Blas*, Milton's prose, Hume and Smollett's *History of England* and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.*

The Society has several advertisements of forthcoming books, the earliest of which is a photostat of a printed letter written by Frederick Green at Annapolis in May, 1785, announcing that he had undertaken to print for public use all the laws of the colony " from Bacon's Collection up to the present time." Another photostat of a broadside dated May 4, 1785, gives the terms and conditions under which the laws will be published. It also has a place for the signature of those wishing to subscribe to the volume when published.[3]

At Annapolis, in 1762, Jonas Green, printer, in a petition addressed to Governor Horatio Sharpe and the General Assembly, stated that although he had been acting as a printer for the past twenty-four years, he had not received sufficient remuneration for his services.[4]

According to an early broadside (Feb. 22, 1782), Mary

ing information about the Temascaltepec Mining Company operating in Mexico, but chartered in Maryland; advertisement of Valerius Dukehart, 101½ Baltimore Street, printed in March, 1832, giving the various items which he offers for sale; a photostat of an advertisement of a " Patent Platform Scales," and other kinds of weighing apparatus, which, in 1844, Jesse Marden offered for sale in Baltimore.

[3] There are two other advertisements of forthcoming books, including " Proposals, by Elizabeth Chase, for publishing, by subscription, a translation of the Punicks of Silius Italicus by her father, the Rev. Thomas Chase, formerly rector of St. Paul's Parish, Baltimore." Thomas Chase was the father of Samuel Chase. Subscriptions to this book, which was to cost $2.50, were to be received by the publisher, Edward J. Coale, bookseller, whose office was opposite the Post Office, in Baltimore. It is interesting to note that the Society has this translation in manuscript form. It does not appear to have been published. The advertisement of the proposed publication of Thomas Chase's book has no date.

More successful in his efforts, however, was John Kilty when on Oct. 28th, 1806, he proposed to publish, by public subscription, " The Landholder's Assistant, and Land-Office Guide," This book, as the title indicates, is an exposition of how title to land might be acquired.

[4] On May 26, 1859, Joseph Robinson published a broadside addressed " To the Convention of the P. E. Church of Maryland," in which he justified the price which he had asked for printing the Journal of the Convention.

Katherine Goddard, another printer, had her office in Baltimore at the Post Office, on Market (now Baltimore) Street, where, in addition to engaging in the printing business, she sold handkerchiefs, shirts, snuff, stationery, pictures, medicines, etc.

Two broadsides relate to Hezekiah Niles, who was for many years editor of Niles' *Weekly Register*. In one, addressed "To the People of Baltimore," dated Sept. 1st, 1831, and signed by Niles, the latter states his platform as candidate for the office of Elector of Senate. Niles promised to try to secure proper representation for Baltimore in both the Senate and the House of Delegates. This broadside also contains an account of the wide distribution of his *Register*, which, he says, is better known in New York than in Baltimore where it was published. The files of the *Weekly*, Niles said, could be found at nearly all the principal seats of government in the world. It had brought to Baltimore at least $200,000. which had been expended in the city for labor and materials. The *Register*, he claimed, was free of any party affiliations.

The other broadside, or handbill, also published in 1831, is addressed "To the Working Men, Mechanics and others," and was signed by "A Laboring Man." This contains a plea to vote for Niles as an elector to represent Baltimore in the College of Electors of the Senate of Maryland.

Libraries

In Baltimore, during the year 1773, there was published a broadside entitled "Proposals for Establishing a Circulating Library in Baltimore-Town." This handbill points out the many advantages such a library of eight hundred volumes would have, including giving young people an opportunity of reading good books "under the eye of their parents and friends." The yearly subscription to this library, which was four dollars, could be sent either to William Goddard's printing office in Baltimore or to the Coffee House or Fountain Inn.

Newspapers

A broadside dealing with the freedom of the press was published in 1812. It is entitled "Sacred to the Memory of Gen. James M. Lingan, one of the heroes of '76 . . ." and is an elegiac

poem in Lingan's honor for his having died for the liberty of the press, when, on July 28th, 1812, he was killed by a mob. Another broadside (1819) addressed "To the Freemen of Frederick County," criticizes Samuel Barnes, one of the editors of a Whig newspaper, who was charged with having incited acts of violence which resulted in General Lingan's death. People of Frederick were told not to vote for Barnes or for William E. Williams, who, it was alleged, had said that "no poor man ought to have a vote."

"Freeman of Frederick County, Look at This!" is the title of one broadside, signed by John P. Thomson, and published on Oct. 1st, 1819. This is an attempt by Thomson, who was editor of the *Frederick-Town Herald*, to show that James F. Huston, postmaster at Frederick and a Democrat, had purposely delayed sending out the *Herald* on the eve of an important election. This, it was claimed, was "a shameful attempt to withhold . . . the benefits of a free press. . . ." In another broadside, dated August 27, 1831, addressed "To the Voters of Harford County," Thomas Hope, who signed it, threatened to sue the editors of the *Independent Citizen* for libel. Hope, who was a school commissioner for Harford County, had been accused in the newspaper of "fraudulent practices in the application and distribution of the School Funds. . . ." [5]

At the end of the year it was the custom of newsboys to address an appeal for money to those to whom they had delivered copies of their newspaper during the year. The Society has many broadsides containing such addresses. The earliest two are the most interesting. One, dated Jan. 1, 1780, is called "The Humble Address of Tobias Bond and Benjamin Welch, flying mercuries, or newsboys, vulgarly styled printer's devils, to the worthy customers of the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser." The other is addressed to the subscribers of the same newspaper, but is of a later date, Jan. 1, 1785, and the newsboy's name is Caleb.

[5] The Society's collection contains broadsides supplying information about the publication and price of newspapers, such as one printed in Cumberland in March, 1845, announcing a new Whig paper there to be called "The Independent." During the same year there appeared in Baltimore a broadside announcing a reduction in the subscription price of the "Christian Advocate and Journal."

Information about a newspaper is contained in a broadside published at Easton, Maryland, in January, 1837. It is entitled "Prospectus. To the Patrons of the Eastern-Shore Whig and People's Advocate and to the Public Generally." It was signed by Geo. W. Sherwood, who said that his newspaper, which was $2.50 per annum, needed support.

In order to give some idea of these addresses, this one is quoted in full:

As life is said a stage to be,
An humble Part's allotted me;
And tho' I'm call'd a Printer's Devil,
On New-Year's Day I'm very civil.
Good masters all attend I pray,
To what poor Caleb now will say;
His Mistresses who are so kind,
Will gratify his humble Mind.
Caleb is proud to bring your News,
Which you with Pleasure may peruse;
To please you all is his Intent,
For this his Time's in Labour spent:
He chearful runs thro' Frost and Snow,
That you the weekly News may know;
Then let poor Cale your Goodness share,
And you will have his New-Year's Prayer;
A little Pittance from your Store,
Will gain the Blessings of the Poor;
A happy Year Cale wishes all;
Then let on him your Bounty fall:
He hopes to find all Parties willing,
And will rejoice to feel—a SHILLING.

Newsboys probably received assistance in the preparation of their verses. One address states that the lines were written without any help by a lad of fourteen as though this was unusual. As he considered them suitable for his purpose, the carrier, in one instance, republished lines which had been written by Brantz Mayer.[6]

[6] See "Address to the Patrons of the Western Continent by the Carrier, Jan. 1, 1849." There are these additional newsboy New Year addresses to their patrons for the following newspapers: *Baltimore Evening Post*, 1811; *Niles' Weekly Register*, 1814; *American and Commercial Daily Advertiser*, 1814, 1817, 1831; *Baltimore Telegraph*, 1816; *Federal Gazette*, 1816, 1825; *Baltimore Patriot and Evening Advertiser*, 1817, 1819; *Morning Chronicle and Baltimore Advertiser*, 1820; *Baltimore Gazette*, 1827, 1829-1831, 1836; *Saturday Morning Visiter*, 1836; *Daily Republican and Argus*, 1846; *Baltimore Patriot*, 1846, 1855, 1859; *Western Continent* (verse by Brantz Mayer), 1849. There are also carrier addresses for the years 1828, 1875 and 1879, but the name of the newspaper is not given; also two of no date to the patrons of the *Leader* and *The Gazette*.

It is interesting to note that it was also once the custom of watchmen to solicit money during the holiday season. See handbill entitled "Watchman's Address on the Return of Christmas, 1846." The duties of a watchman are reviewed in a broadside dated Oct. 15, 1830, which is addressed "To the Voters of Baltimore." Lads who made a living shining shoes also asked for money at Christmas. See "The Boot Black Boy's Address to his Patrons."

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

The Society has several broadsides relating to this subject. One notice offers one hundred and fifty dollars reward for the capture of Philip Cole, a mulatto, who stole between 300 and 400 dollars. The money was taken at the General Wayne tavern, located on the corner of Paca and Baltimore Streets. Cole is described as " slim in the face, high cheek bones . . . and a down look with a smile." This notice bears the date of October 2, 1844.[7]

Another broadside, printed in 1820, is about Morris N. B. Hull, a mail robber, under sentence of death. It contains an appeal to the citizens of Baltimore and recapitulates the facts that helped to extenuate the guilt of Hull. The author of the broadside, a man named Williams, explained that Hull, a youth of twenty, acted under the influence of Perry Hutton, an older man, and his partner in crime. For this reason Williams asks that Hull's death sentence be commuted to one of life imprisonment. Besides Williams' appeal, the broadside contains two letters, one written by Hull to his father which he signs, " from your guilty, afflicted, undutiful and imprisoned son," and the other is Hull's reply to the judge who sentenced him. In his letter to the judge the boy admitted the enormity of his crime and expressed a wish that he might be able to help the woman he had widowed and the children he had made fatherless. Williams' plea was in vain: both Hull and Hutton were hanged.[8]

There is one handbill in the form of a proclamation issued March, 1851, by Enoch Louis Lowe, then Governor of Maryland. It states that in view of four foul murders committed in Kent County, he, the Governor, offered a reward of $1,000 " for the apprehension and conviction of the person, or persons, by whom the said murder was committed."

Another broadside relates to William Chase Barney, of Balti-

[7] One notice printed in Baltimore at the office of the *Morning Chronicle* on Oct. 1, 1823, offers fifty dollars reward for the return of 218 dollars which was lost out of a wagon on the way to Washington. The money, according to the notice, was " deposited in a pair of saddlebags, and the remnant in a handkerchief; all of this was rolled up together in a mattress & left in a waggon." For a handbill referring to the theft of a horse, see text under heading of " Transportation by Land and Water."

[8] For a discussion of this case see J. Thomas Scharf, *The Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), pp. 398, 399. The blood test or blood ordeal was used in this case.

more. It was published in Philadelphia on Jan. 15, 1846, by T. Jones. In it Jones makes assertions to show Barney a swindler against whom people should be on their guard. He contended that Barney had swindled people not only in Baltimore, but also in London, Paris and Wilmington, Delaware. In the latter place, it was said, he had also seduced a young colored girl.[9]

DISEASE AND DOCTORS

Disease

Two broadsides refer to disease. One was printed on Nov. 18, 1800, and gives "extracts from an ordinance to mitigate the distress occasioned by the late prevailing fever." It is signed by James Calhoun, then Mayor of Baltimore. By the provisions of the ordinance a number of persons were appointed in each ward "to inspect into the condition of the poor therein, and grant recommendations or orders . . . to such of them as they shall discover to be really in want and who have not the means of subsisting themselves, to receive such articles or supplies as shall be provided at the public expense. . . ." Among the persons

[9] The oldest broadside dealing with crime is in regard to the alleged high treason of Charles, 3rd Lord Baltimore. It is entitled "The Case of the Lord Baltimore." In it Charles alleges that he has been outlawed for high treason in Ireland for being in rebellion there against the government. The petitioner contends that as he has never been in Ireland he could not have been guilty of treason there. Charles said that since he is in ill health he cannot appeal to the King's Bench in Ireland to reverse the outlawry, he therefore asks that a bill be brought in the English Parliament to reverse it. Undated; *circa* 1651.

On May 4, 1794, there was published in Baltimore a broadside addressed "To the Citizens of Baltimore-Town," signed by Samuel Chase. In this Chase said that he had Captain David Stodder arrested because he had refused "to enter into recognizance, and with security" for his appearance at court to answer the charge against him of acts amounting to riot. Chase said that as he could not permit acts destructive of all order he had been compelled to do this.

In a broadside, dated Aug. 26, 1806, and addressed "To the Public," Robert Dodson refuted the charge made by one John Dawson that he had attempted to cheat him out of one and a half dollars per hundredweight on two hogsheads of tobacco.

Another broadside deserving mention contains "Judge Carmichael's Charge to the Grand Jury of Talbot County on Arbitrary Arrests." In this charge, which he gave at the November term, 1861, the Judge deplored the incidents where soldiers, with no pretense of authority but their arms, had invaded houses and dragged the inmates to prison. Such arbitrary, illegal, and false imprisonments, Carmichael claimed, were contrary to law. For expressing such opinions the Judge was dragged from the bench by Union soldiers and beaten. He was later imprisoned. See J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1879), III, 490, 491.

appointed in the various wards were Isaac Trimble, David Poe, Jesse Tyson, Robert McKim and others.

The other broadside relating to disease was printed in Baltimore on June 29, 1832. Issued by Archbishop James Whitfield, it was addressed to the clergy and laity of "our diocese." The Archbishop asked that the priests and laity should offer prayers to avert the cholera then raging abroad and which had recently appeared in America. For this reason he ordered a public mass to be celebrated on the Fourth of July.

Doctors

In a broadside addressed to "To the People of Harford County," by Dr. John Archer, dated August 31, 1826, mention is made of a meeting called to regulate the charges of physicians. Apparently the fees were actually reduced.

Dr. S. K. Jennings, "professor of midwifery and of the Diseases of Women and children in the Washington University of Baltimore," had a notice published in January, 1844, in which he stated that women desiring to consult him at his office might do so and he promised to make "the necessary investigation in the most delicate manner."

An undated handbill bears the title: "Take Notice! Two Ways only lead to this Shop, Charity or Money." It contains the following statement:

> A Physician much employed, has no time to lose in idle conversation—tell your case clearly, and in as few words as possible—do not ask the same questions a thousand times over—listen to what you are told, profit by it, and let the Physician attend to those duties that are incumbent to his profession.[10]

DUELLING AND THE CODE OF HONOR

Four broadsides, printed in the year 1833, relate to a duel. While duelling was prohibited in Maryland, it was not in the District of Columbia. Alexander Hambleton and Joseph R. Price, both of the Eastern Shore, were the men involved. It appears that at a political rally held in Trappe on the 21st of September

[10] A broadside published in Frederick on Oct. 2, 1837, contains an advertisement of lectures on phrenology to be given at the court house by Dr. Collyer, a pupil of the late Dr. Spurzheim.

Mr. Samuel Hambleton was making a speech in behalf of his candidacy for the legislature. Samuel was a brother of Alexander Hambleton. During the speech Price made some remarks which Alexander considered as an attempt to interrupt his brother and he so informed Mr. Price. The latter, resenting Alexander's interference, tweaked his nose not only once but twice. After suffering this indignity, Alexander challenged Price to a duel.

Plans were drawn up for the duel which was to take place in the District of Columbia, near Bladensburgh. The duellists were to stand eight yards apart facing one another. Charles A. Tilghman acted as the second for Price, while Edward O. Martin was Hambleton's second.

The question involved in the series of broadsides was whether Price, or Hambleton, had made a genuine attempt to meet the other in mortal combat. This depended in part on whether the ground chosen by Price's second was actually in the District of Columbia or not. The broadsides go into great detail and each antagonist endeavours to show that he did his part. Price called Hambleton " thou vilest of paltrons—thou most pitiable of cowards," in one broadside, while Hambleton in a handbill called Price " a scoundrel and a coward." Both contestants appear to have been satisfied with this exchange of verbal broadsides. It is doubtful if the duel ever took place.[11]

There are broadsides regarding other controversies which did not result in a challenge to a duel. Two other Eastern Shoremen, Price Martindale and William Marsh Catrup, were involved in an acrimonious dispute. A broadside, published in 1806, probably at Easton, was addressed by Catrup " To the Public, Friends and Fellow Citizens." A number of persons are mentioned, including a Mr. Strut who was horsewhipped and another man who was sent to the whipping post. As for Martindale, Catrup said that he did not think that the public will take " the bare word of Such a d – n – d lying, mean, shuffling, infamous scoundrel as Price Martindale—that the very scourings of perdition could not turn out such another." Catrup concluded by saying that he was

[11] Of the broadsides which deal with this controversy, two are dated October 2, 1833. One is a signed statement by Edward O. Martin, Hambleton's second, and the other is a signed statement by Price. A third broadside is signed by Alexander Hambleton as the latter had decided to answer Price's account of the affair. The fourth broadside, dated Oct. 10, 1833, is signed by P. F. Thomas, who accompanied Mr. Price. All four broadsides are addressed " To the Public."

not afraid of Martindale or " any weapons that he would wish to make use of." [12]

The Society has a very large broadside dated Jan. 22, 1811, addressed " To the People of Calvert County," in which names were also called but no duel resulted. In this dispute James M. Taylor described the conduct of Samuel Turner as " ungentlemanly . . . cowardly and disgraceful," to which Mr. Turner replied that Dr. Taylor was the originator of " base and infamous falsehoods, a calumniator and no gentleman."

One of the most picturesque figures in colonial Maryland was Bennet Allen, an Anglican minister. He engaged in many quarrels, including one with Walter Dulany, which ended in a cane and fist fight, and another with Lloyd Dulany, a brother of Walter, which resulted in a duel.[13]

There are several broadsides which deal with a controversy between Luther Martin and Robert Lemmon. In view of Martin's irascible nature, it is rather curious that the dispute did not result in a fist fight or a duel. It appears that Lemmon had made public some correspondence which Martin, then Attorney General of the State, thought contained a slur on his character. Martin also resented being represented by Lemmon as a Tory. During the controversy a verse appeared which made fun of Lemmon. Dedicated to the " August and Venerable Robert Lemmon," it read:

> Hail to the man, decreed by fate
> To be a pillar of the State!
> A pillar, tho' a rotten one,
> For fools and knaves to rest upon . . .
> A front incas'd with tenfold brass,
> In ignorance a very ass . . .

James Ryan writing in behalf of Dr. Robert Lemmon said that the physician had been educated " in the most respectable seminary of learning in the city of Dublin," while Martin was born of " a low family." [14]

[12] See " Memoranda of the Annals of Talbot County," " Social Annals," No. II, pp. 94-96, collected by S. A. Harrison. In Maryland Historical Society.

[13] Information regarding the controversy between Bennet Allen and Walter Dulany is contained in three broadsides all addressed " To the Public," one dated May 28, 1768, and the other two, dated Nov. 9, 1768. For an account of this quarrel and of his duel with Lloyd Dulany, see Josephine Fisher, " Bennet Allen, Fighting Parson," in *Maryland Historical Magazine*, vols. XXXVIII and XXXIX.

[14] The following broadsides throw light on this controversy: " Queries to the Whigs of Maryland," Baltimore, Feb. 16, 1779; " To the Public," signed by

EDUCATION

The most interesting broadside which the Society has in this field is the act for founding Washington College, at Chestertown, on the Eastern Shore. This handbill was printed in 1782, probably in Philadelphia. Addressed "To the inhabitants of the Eastern Shore of Maryland," it discusses the advantages such an institution would give to the youths on the Eastern Shore who previously had to go to England or to a neighboring colony for their education. The broadside has the names of those who had contributed to the college.

Another dealing with education is the "Catalogue of the Faculty and Students of Dickinson College, Carlisle, December, 1811." While this was a Pennsylvania institution, a number of Maryland boys attended there as their names appear in the catalogue. Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney graduated from Dickinson College in 1795.

Of an early date is a circular printed by Matthias Bartgis & Son, in Frederick, entitled "Friendly Hints in Various Subjects." Advice is given to children as to how they should behave at home, in school and at church. Children were also admonished to be thrifty and were told that they could get cash, or books, for all

Robert Lemmon, Baltimore, Sept. 18, 1779; "Queries addressed to Robert Lemmon, Esq.," signed "A Friend to Justice," Baltimore, Oct. 22, 1779; "A pedantic PEDAGOGUE, suddenly metamorphosed into a GENERAL OF LAW . . ." signed by James Ryan, Baltimore, Nov. 4, 1779; two broadsides, both printed in Baltimore, and addressed to Martin and Lemmon by some one who signs "Cineas," one dated Nov. 17, 1779, and the other Dec. 27, 1779. While the following are not broadsides, they also relate to this controversy: "An Address to Robert Lemmon, Esq. by Luther Martin," Baltimore, 1779; "To the Public," signed Luther Martin, Baltimore, Aug. 19, 1779; "To Robert Lemmon, Esq.," signed L. Martin, Baltimore, Oct. 2, 1779. M. K. Goddard was the printer of all the items mentioned in this footnote.

The Society has four broadsides all published at Annapolis in 1788 which deal with a dispute in regard to the sale of a boat. Those involved were Captain Andrew Bryson and his friend and agent, John Davidson, and the firm of Yates and Petty. It appears that John Petty was ordered by the court to pay Captain Bryson a sum of money due him for the sale of the ship *Kitty*. Petty, however, refused to do so on the ground that Bryson's account was fraudulent. Petty even tried to have Bryson indicted by a grand jury but the case was dismissed.

When John Davidson, agent of Captain Bryson, published a broadside in the captain's defence, Petty took him to task for "his unprovoked, indecent, and virulent publication." Davidson replied in another broadside calling Petty "turbulent and vindictive . . . an addle-pate," who has "bespattered me liberally." All four broadsides are addressed "To the Public." Two were signed by John Petty and two by John Davidson. Printed at Annapolis by Frederick Green, they were dated July 1, 18, Aug. 18, Sept. 16, 1788.

the linen or cotton rags they had saved at Bartgis' Bookstore, in Frederick, or at his paper mill, five miles from Frederick. This broadside has no date.

For a number of years prior to the Civil War a Miss Diana T. Kilbourn conducted an academy for young ladies in Baltimore. The Society has a printed copy of the rules which the pupils were supposed to observe. From reading these regulations one can obtain an idea of the conduct expected of a young girl of this period, who, even when out of school, was not " to talk and laugh loud, or to behave in any manner unbecoming a modest, refined child or woman."

There are two broadsides relating to the Frederick Female Seminary. One of them, published about 1841, gives the " order of exercises " to be observed at the examination of this academy, and the other, printed four years later, is a memorial addressed to the General Assembly of Maryland by a number of citizens of Frederick in which they protest against any interference with the present administration of the school.

Two early handbills concern schools in Talbot County. Both are addressed " To the Voters of Talbot county." One of them, printed Oct. 2, 1830, is signed by " a land renter " who maintains that " the rich landholder must submit to be taxed, or the Primary School bill [for the education of the poor] must fall to the ground." The other broadside was printed ten years later (Sept. 30, 1840) at Easton and was signed by Samuel Hambleton, Jr. In this Hambleton defended his voting against the school law of the county on the ground that the bill contained a provision to tax income. Hambleton argued that " taxation should be laid on property alone, not on the income of a man; on the sweat of his brow."

FINANCES

Some of the oldest broadsides in the possession of the Society deal with this subject. One dated Jan. 30, 1777, and printed in Baltimore deals with bills of credit issued by the States. Another item (1784), published by Alex. Contee Hanson, is about the State debt. There is also a fiscal report for Dec. 24, 1784, submitted by Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Intendant of the Revenue. This is in the nature of a reply to Hanson. Another early broadside is a financial report presented in 1797 by William Marbury. Of a later date, Sept. 21, 1814, is a handbill addressed " To the

Citizens of Talbot," and signed by " A Friend to Justice." In this the writer points out how the people of the county have overpaid in taxes " the enormous sum of 1653 dollars and 20 cents." [15]

We wonder what the " Friend to Justice " would have thought of the taxes of today. Also striking another now unfamiliar note is a photostat of a handbill dated Sept. 22, 1786, and addressed by Legh Master " To the Worthy Electors of Frederick County." Master offered himself as a candidate for the Assembly from Frederick county and gave as one of his reasons for running for office that " in point of Fortune, I am Independent, therefore have nothing in view but the true Interest of the State, and this County." Master promised that if elected he would bestow his salary as an Assemblyman " in such manner as the Electors shall think most proper."

FIRE COMPANIES

Some of the most interesting broadsides which the Society possesses deal with the early fire fighting companies in Baltimore. The oldest, printed in 1792, is entitled " Articles for the Government of the Commercial Fire-Company of Baltimore." In order to protect their houses from fire a number of citizens mutually agreed to take certain protective measures. Among these measures were the purchase of two leather buckets, a bag and a basket. These articles, marked with the owner's name and also the name of the fire company, were hung near the front door of each dwelling house. Several members of the company were given keys to

[15] While they cannot be classified as broadsides, the Society has the fiscal reports of Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer for the years 1784 and 1785. There are also two items for the year 1786; the one dated Feb. 22 is a discussion of black money and continental state money, while the other, dated Sept. 23 is an article signed by " A Friend to Paper Money." For additional information about these items, see Joseph Towne Wheeler, *The Maryland Press, 1777-1790* (Baltimore, 1938), p. 175. Information can be found in Wheeler about many of the broadsides under discussion. See also on the same subject, Lawrence C. Wroth, *A History of Printing in Colonial Maryland, 1686-1776* (Baltimore, 1922).

There are other items dealing with financial matters. One is a copy of the Baltimore County levy for the year 1827, while the other is the letter George Mackubin, Treasurer of the Western Shore of Maryland, in answer to inquiries regarding the state of the finances. This letter is dated Aug. 10, 1836. There are also several broadsides which concern financial matters in places outside of Baltimore. One is entitled " Retrenchment," dated Dec. 6, 1844, and is about a meeting to be held in Liberty Town to consider the reduction of taxes; another is a broadside of the Frederick " Examiner," for Oct. 11, 1854, relative to corporation taxation. It quotes from the letter of J. V. L. McMahon. The Society also has a broadside containing a memorial of the citizens of Frederick asking for relief from taxation. This has no date. It is entitled " Please Read."

the engine house. Upon hearing the cry of "Fire," these members would pull the fire engine to the scene of the fire. Other members reported there with their buckets, bags and baskets. Any one neglecting to go to the fire might be fined.

Broadsides relating to fire companies have a list of the members of their respective companies. It was necessary to be elected to membership in a fire company and it was considered an honor to belong to one. The rosters of the fire companies contain some of Baltimore's most prominent citizens.

The Society has a number of broadsides, or handbills, of these fire companies, including the "Articles for the Government of the Union Fire Company in Baltimore," which were adopted on Feb. 1, 1803. According to the provisions of these articles, the company was divided into three divisions, the first two divisions being composed of young men whose duty it was to work the fire and water engines. The third division, composed of older men, was "to repair to the Engines in time of fire, and take possession of such property as may be in their power to save. . . ."

Two handbills relate to another Baltimore fire company. One is the "Constitution of the First Baltimore Hose Company," adopted in 1814. The other, dated Jan. 1821, contains a list of the members of this company who associated themselves "for the purpose of forming a Suction Engine and Hose Company. . . ." Among the officers were eight directors who were in charge of the fire fighting apparatus at the time of a fire. Directors were to designate members of the company as "hose guards, suction engine men, and hose carriage guards." At the time of a fire, "when the engine is placed and the hose spread, the suction engine men shall work the engine; the hose guards shall distribute themselves along the line of hose to protect it from injury or abuse; and the hose carriage guards shall take charge of the carriage." [16]

[16] The Society has the lists of the members of the Washington Hose Company in 1816 and 1823 when Jesse Hunt was president. Hunt was later mayor of Baltimore. Besides giving the names of the officers of the company, the lists also contain the names of the directors, engineers, ax men, hose men, suction men, and hose carriage guards. In the collection are also the lists of the officers and men of the following fire companies: New Market Fire Company, 1843; Mechanical Fire Company, 1844 (photostat); Patapsco Fire Company, 1856. There is also another list of the Patapsco Fire Company of an earlier date which has an interesting drawing of the type of fire engine then in use. This company was instituted in 1822 and the Mechanical Fire Company in 1763.

Other items relating to fires or fire companies include a printed form, or notice,

Another interesting item is a handbill, or " brief," as it is called, issued by Governor Horatio Sharpe in May, 1766, which tells of a disastrous fire in Boston rendering over two hundred families homeless and objects of charity. In view of this catastrophe, Sharpe asks that the people of Maryland contribute " on this Occasion, towards alleviating the Miseries of the unhappy Sufferers. . . . "

GROWTH OF BALTIMORE

The Society has several broadsides which throw light on this subject. There is, for example, a petition of the inhabitants of Baltimore county (*circa* 1768) addressed to Governor Horatio Sharpe and the Upper and Lower Houses of the Assembly in which it is requested that the county seat, then in Joppa, should be moved to Baltimore. The petition sets forth the reasons for making this change. There are several copies of this petition in both English and German. Many of the copies are signed in longhand by those inhabitants of Baltimore county who favored this change.

One broadside contains a " List of Families and other persons residing in the Town of Baltimore . . . in the year 1752." [17] The next item, in point of time, is entitled " Baltimore-Town, Committee-Chamber, Dec. 2, 1784." It seems that a committee of men met at the Assembly Room, in Baltimore, and recommended that the residents of the town be incorporated " in deed and in name." In order to obtain the opinion of the citizens on this recommendation, a meeting was called on December 9th at the Court House. It was not until 1796, however, that Baltimore received its act of incorporation from the General Assembly. A broadside, dated Jan. 16, 1797, contains a copy of this act.

Another handbill, or broadside, which relates to the growth of Baltimore is entitled " A Summary of all the monies received and paid by the Register, from Feb. 1, 1809 to Jan. 31, 1810, inclusive." While this broadside could be classified with matters deal-

to members of the Deptford Fire Company of Baltimore requesting attendance at the annual meeting on Jan. 2, 1837, for the election of officers. There is also a certificate of the Franklin Fire Company, instituted in 1809, which certified the election of a member to the company, and a certificate of the Baltimore Fire Insurance Company, incorporated in 1807, stating that the house of George Macgill is insured against fire.

[17] J. Thomas Scharf, *The Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), p. 49.

ing with finance, it is referred to here because of the information which it gives about Baltimore at this time. Mention is made in the summary of the oiling and winding of the town clock, of finishing the water tower, of the new mud machine, of stepping stones and flagstones, and of the maintenance of the city springs on Calvert Street.

Conditions in Baltimore about twenty-five years later are described in another broadside entitled "An Earnest and Direct Appeal to those Citizens of Baltimore, who vainly claim to be considered ORDERLY, and which the late lamentable events seems to require." This handbill, dated Sept. 7, 1835, points out how disorderly conditions in Baltimore really are: that habitual drunkards frequent the streets uttering blasphemous remarks; that trash and garbage remain in the streets without being collected; that persons go through the town on horseback, or in carriages, much too fast " and will seldom rein up, for the passage of old men, women and children."

There are two odes which commemorate important events in the history of the city. The words of one of them, written by John H. B. Latrobe, were sung by the public school children at the inauguration or dedication of Druid Hill Park on the 8th of October, 1860. The other ode was sung by high school girls at the laying of the corner-stone of the new City Hall, October 18, 1867. The author of this poem is not known.[18]

On that perennial controversy of Baltimore versus the counties the Society has three broadsides. One is addressed "To the Voters of Talbot County" (*circa* 1818?), and is signed by "A Plain Man," who states that " the Federalists say if the Democrats get the election, Baltimore will rule the state; but the Democrats say they are not half so fond of the Western Shore as the Federalists are." Another broadside, printed in 1819, and entitled "To the Polls! Freemen of Frederick County" contains the statement that " the Democrats openly declare that they wish the

[18] Two broadsides, dated 1748, relate to the creation of Frederick county. In both these handbills the advantages of Frederick Town as the county seat of the new county is emphasized. Frederick's population was largely German at that time.

Another broadside printed over a hundred years later, that is, in 1853, contains an appeal to the voters of Baltimore county to make Towson Town the county seat of justice. Certain residents promised to give land for the erection of a court house and jail and J. Ridgely, of Hampton, promised to give forty acres of land for an alms house near Towson.

governor of the state to be elected by a general ticket. In other words, they mean to give the election of Governor to Baltimore. . . . Baltimore will rule the state!"

The third item (Sept. 27, 1836) is addressed "To the People of Maryland." In it the Democratic General Committee of Baltimore maintain that they believe "a representation for Baltimore equal to that which the largest county will be entitled, would be acceptable. . . ."

LOTTERIES

Broadsides giving notices of the holding of lotteries constitute an interesting portion of the Society's collection. The oldest is dated May 30, 1764, and it was printed at Annapolis. It mentions "A Lottery for disposing of a large and valuable collection of books, maps, etc." It is signed by William Rind, who was apprenticed to Jones Green, and, during the years 1758-1766 was Green's partner in publishing the *Maryland Gazette*.[19] Another early item is a notice of a "Bridge Lottery" held at Elizabeth (Hager's) Town for the purpose of raising money to build a bridge over the Conococheague river. The notice is dated Mar. 12, 1790.

Of a later date, Nov. 1, 1817, is a broadside giving notice of a "Great Surgical Lottery," the highest prize offered being $100,000. The notice states that tickets and shares could be obtained at Cohen's, 110 Market Street, Baltimore. One of the most picturesque lottery notices in appearance is a handbill dated Feb. 1823. It is an advertisement of Conine's who had a lottery office near the Marsh Market. It states that tickets for the State Lottery could be obained there, and, in order to induce the public to buy tickets, it has the following verse:

Hark! hear you not Dame Fortune call,
To bid you to her shrine,
And beg you purchase, one and all
A Ticket from Conine . . .
There lives not one, who now would scorn,
To be Dame Fortune's minion,
For Fame blows thro' a golden horn
Much louder than a tin one.

Another advertisement of Conine's, dated Mar. 8, 1825, announces Maryland State Lottery no. III. The highest prize was $40,000. The payment of all prizes was guaranteed by the State.

[19] Wroth, p. 85.

There are several other notices of lotteries, one dated Nov. 17, 1849, announcing a " 33,000 dollars Grand Consolidated Lottery of Maryland," and the other, dated May 10, 1856, mentioning a " Maryland Lottery, to be drawn in Baltimore on the Havana Plan." This was an advertisement of Irwin & Company, who were agents for the sale of lottery tickets and whose offices were in the basement of Barnum's Hotel. There are also two notices of lotteries for the year 1853, published by C. S. McDonald & Company, lottery agents for the State of Maryland.[20]

Different from the usual lottery was the " Coale Lottery." The notice, which was dated Sept. 1835, states that in view of the small amount of property left by the late Edward J. Coale, the Maryland State Legislature had authorized his widow to dispose of his property under the supervision of trustees. Among the objects offered for sale by lottery were a portrait of Washington, by " the elder Peale," which was valued at one hundred dollars, and a ring, presented to Coale by the Emperor Alexander, of Russia, containing 175 diamonds with a central oriental topaz. The ring was valued at $1,000.

ORGANIZATIONS

Art

The Society has a stock certificate of the old Baltimore Museum, on Holliday Street, issued on May 14, 1816. Signed by Rembrandt Peale, the proprietor, it certifies that Jacob I. Cohen, Jr. is the owner of one share of stock in the museum. On the certificate Peale states that the reason for his issuance of the stock to Cohen and other well-to-do persons is that he hopes to give the institution " the extent and usefulness, which the liberal encouragement of the citizens of Baltimore so justly merits, more speedily and effectually than his own limited means will permit." Holders of shares of stock enjoyed, among other privileges, the right of free admission to the museum where there was a " Cabinet of Natural History and Miscellaneous Curiosities, together with the Gallery of Paintings."

[20] The Society has a number of lottery tickets. According to the provisions of the Constitution of Maryland ratified in June, 1851, no lotteries could be held in the State after April 1st, 1859. The Constitution of 1867 also prohibited the holding of lotteries.



FOR A CALL AT

Conine's

No. 32 Market street, near the Marsh Market, Baltimore.

Hark! hear you not Dame Fortune call,
To bid you to her shrine,
And beg you purchase, one and all,
A Ticket from CONINE.
When doughty heroes used *Cologne*,
Or dressed in *Silken* Coats;
That shield 'gainst bullets was not known,
A parcel of Bank Notes.

There lives not one, who now would scorn,
To be Dame Fortune's minion,
For Fame blows thro' a golden horn
Much louder than a tin one.

The mad-cap wights who lately fought,
To win a name in story;
Were not aware that *money* bought
A greater meed of glory.

For Fame has left the fields of strife,
Left vi'lets show white shrine;
And calls on maiden, man and wife
To woo her with CONINE.
To buy, where blanks were never sold,
She all her friends advises,
And tells them, that with glittering gold,
CONINE will pay the prizes.

THE
State
LOTTERY
now drawing
presents a great
CHANCE
FOR
HIGH PRIZES.



Prompt application for chances, is adviseable. No risk of a Blank until the Lottery is ended.

FEBRUARY 4, 1823

ANNOUNCEMENT OF A LOTTERY BROKER

From the Society's Collection of Broadsides.

Literary

Information can be gleaned from broadsides regarding literary, and social organizations of Maryland. Of a literary character is a broadside dated Feb. 22, 1830, which announced "Lectures on the Natural Sciences at the Baltimore Athenaeum." Those desiring to hear these addresses were requested to give their names to Messrs. Edward J. Coale, Fielding Lucas, Jr. and others.[21]

Two broadsides refer to the Society. One of them is entitled "Maryland Historical Society" and it was probably printed in 1844 as it refers to the recently organized society. It is a form letter from a committee of the Society, composed of Brantz Mayer, S. Teackle Wallis, and Frederick W. Brune, Jr. Besides asking the person to whom the letter was addressed to allow his name to be proposed for membership, the letter mentions the advantages to be gained by having such a Society and also describes what kinds of manuscripts and printed material the Society proposes to collect and preserve. The other broadside, also undated, is entitled "The Library Company of Baltimore." This refers to an agreement which this company had made in 1845 with the Maryland Historical Society by which "donations were obtained for the purpose of building the edifice that is now completed, and that belongs to the two societies jointly, by the title of the Athenaeum, under an act of incorporation from the Legislature." This broadside contains a list of the newspapers, magazines, etc. which could be found in the reading room. Chess tables were available "in the Conversation Room." [22]

Social

The earliest broadside dealing with social organizations is dated Nov. 10, 1789. It is about the "Baltimore Assembly," of which the managers at this time were D. Harris, G. Buchanan, W. Van Wyck, W. Robb, R. Curson and D. Sterett. These men formulated rules to be observed at the dance because, so the notice stated, "the most minute Attention to every Sentiment of Polite-

[21] There are two broadsides regarding lectures given on Ancient Egypt. One was probably printed in 1844; the second is dated 1845. The lecturer was George R. Gliddon.

[22] Of a much more recent date (May 12, 1913) is a photostat of a petition which the members of the Maryland Historical Society addressed "To the Citizens of Maryland" asking contributions "to the extent of $200,000 for a Building and Endowment Fund."

ness and Decorum is absolutely necessary. . . . " Dancing began at half past seven and lasted until one in the morning. " Gentlemen in Boots " were not permitted to enter the ballroom. According to the rules:

> The Ladies will draw for their Places in the Dance; the drawing must be completed before Half past Seven o'Clock; any Lady coming after that Hour, and wishing to dance, will be placed at the Foot of either Set, as the Managers please.

There are other rules which had to be observed in dancing which it is difficult to understand without knowing more of the kind of dances customary at that time.[23]

RELIGIOUS RECORDS

The Act of Toleration of 1649 was published in broadside form. Although the original of this broadside is now in the New York Public Library, the Society has a photostat of it.

Another item, but an original, is a printed form stating that one Martin Judah on Sept. 14, 1763, when appearing before the Maryland Provincial Court, had taken the oaths of allegiance, abhorrency and abjuration required in naturalizing a foreign Protestant. The applicant for naturalization was also required

[23] The Society has a photostat of the rules observed at a dance held by the " Amicable Society." The rules were similar to those governing the " Baltimore Assembly." This broadside was printed in Baltimore on Nov. 25, 1791. The Society also has a number of tickets of admission issued in the past to various entertainments or to meetings of literary and social organizations.

One humorous item should be mentioned. It is a broadside printed in 1843 entitled " Horn's Dying Speech." Horn's alias was Andrew Hellman. In his speech Horn tells how after a quarrel with his wife he struck her " and she was launched into eternity,—I hope her soul is safe."

The Society has a handbill printed in 1815 which is entitled " Encampment of Knight Templars no. I Maryland." This is a certificate of membership in this order.

There are several items regarding charitable organizations in Maryland. One, undated, concerns " A Plan of the Female Humane Association Charity School." This institution was for little girls between the ages of seven and fourteen. The broadside outlines the duties of the trustees, all of whom were women and also states what was expected of the children. Another item, also without date, is entitled " The Poor of the Third Ward." This is an appeal by the managers of the " Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor," for contributions from residents of the Third Ward to relieve the condition of the impoverished. A third item is a notice, dated Nov. 3, 1817, of a meeting of the Handelian Charitable Society.

While not about a charitable organization, there is another item about the poor of the State, and that is a handbill containing the " Rules of Frederick County Alms House, October, 1833." According to the regulations, inmates of the alms house could be punished by confinement in cells or the infliction of stripes.

to produce a certificate that he had recently received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in a Protestant Church in Maryland.[24]

There are a number of broadsides dealing with the various religious denominations. One gives the "Order of Performance at the Ordination of Mr. Jared Sparks, to the Pastoral Care of the First Independent Church of Baltimore, on Wednesday, May 5, 1819." This was the Unitarian Church. While pastor of this church, Sparks, regarding himself "as an apostle of liberal Christianity to the South, engaged in pamphlet controversy with conservatives. . . ." In April, 1823, much to the regret of his congregation, Sparks resigned as pastor of this church.[25]

Methodists will find an account of "Abingdon and Cokesbury College," written by the Rev. J. W. Fleming, of interest.[26]

[24] The following broadsides deal with controversies between Catholics and Protestants. One dated Oct. 4, 1788, and addressed "To the Roman Catholic Voters in Baltimore Town," is signed by Samuel Chase. Another such handbill has the heading "Facts! Facts!" and is signed by "Truth Teller." There is no date but the time was probably about 1824.

Those interested in the Episcopal Church will find only one item. Undated, it is "An Appeal . . . to erect at old St. Mary's City . . . a memorial church. . . ." This is signed by J. B. Gray, Rector of St. Mary's Parish.

[25] *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVII, 431.

[26] The following items also relate to the Methodist Church. One is a broadside dated August 30, 1816, and addressed "To the Public." It is signed by "A Friend to Truth," who defends Governor Ridgely, a Methodist. Also the following: "Reply to the Baltimore Methodist Trustees," dated Jan. 2, 1827, and signed by John Chappell, Sen. Pres't.; a notice of the death of the Rev. Joseph P. Wilson, of the M. E. Church (1833); "Programma of the M. E. Sunday School Exhibition for Monday evening June 11, 1849 . . ." at Frederick, Maryland.

There are two broadsides about the Presbyterian Church. One is a "Pastoral Letter of the Members of the Second Presbyterian Church and Congregation of Baltimore, Maryland," written by Robert J. Breckinridge at Glasgow, Scotland, on June 19, 1836; the other is a small broadside written "To my Children," by the Rev. Samuel Hindman, of the Associate Presbyterian Church, not long before he died. The date of this is 1853.

One broadside dated Dec. 1891, contains a picture of the old Lutheran Church, in Sharpsburg, Washington County, Maryland, as it appeared after the Battle of Antietam.

Only one broadside is about the Quakers and that is entitled "A Testimony of the Baltimore Monthly Meeting, for the Western District, concerning our deceased friend, Elizabeth Thomas." It is dated Oct. 1838.

The Society has two handbills, or broadsides, which it is impossible to identify with any denomination. One is a "List of Members of the Bible Society of Baltimore, Sept. 1815"; the other is the "Constitution and Bye-Laws of the Female Sabbath School Society of Easton, Maryland." This was probably printed in 1829.

In the Society's collection there are a number of broadsides containing hymns or verses on religious subjects. Perhaps the most interesting of these is a copy of "The Christian's War Song . . . a Popular Camp Meeting Hymn." This was printed in Baltimore but no date of publication is given. Other hymns include: "Hymns for the Annual Meeting of the Sharp Street Baptist Sabbath School," *circa* 1836, by Stephen P. Hill; "Hymn to be sung at the Tenth Anniversary of

SERVANTS AND SLAVES

Servants

There are several handbills in the Society's collection regarding runaway servants and slaves. Two of the notices are about runaway servants. One, dated July 23, 1755, is a photostat of the original which is in a library in Philadelphia. In it Benedict Calvert states that a servant man, a brickmaker by trade, had run away from his plantation at the Woodyard in Prince George's county. It is said that the runaway speaks " very broad English, wears his own Hair, was born in Leicestershire, and is double-jointed. He had on and with him, a Fearnothing Jacket, with black Horn Buttons, two striped Flannel Jackets, two Osnabrigs Shirts, two Pair of Trowsers, a Pair of Shoes, several Pair of Worsted Stockings, and a Pair of Steel Buckles." Calvert promised to give a reward of " two pistoles and reasonable charges " to any one who captured this servant.

The other notice about a runaway servant is dated Baltimore County, Oct. 5, 1777. Forty dollars reward is offered for the capture of Samuel Phillips, a weaver by trade, who had run away from his master, William Goodwin. Phillips was described as having " grey eyes, short straight light hair, which has been cut off the top of his head, red beard, pale complexion, down look, is freckled, and most of his teeth are double." At the time he ran away it is said that he had on " an old black and white linsey under jacket, without sleeves, a country linen shirt, trousers and apron, old shoes tied with strings, and have straps and some iron nails in the heels, an iron collar, and a small shackle on his left leg, with a ring to it." Whoever returned this servant to him, the master, William Goodwin, promised ten dollars. If Phillips was captured thirty miles from home, an additional reward of

the Reformed Church Sabbath Schools, Second Street," no date; a " Centenary Hymn for the centenary celebration of the German Reformed Church in Frederick City, Maryland, on Whitmonday, 1847."

Among the religious verses are the following: " The Dying Saint," composed upon the death of Bishop McKendree, printed on silk in Baltimore in 1843; " The Old Town Clock," by Gen. Wm. H. Hayward. (This is about the sweet-toned bells of the Old Second Street Church); " Daniel in the Lion's Den "; " The Dying Christian "; " Children of Zion," *circa* 1825; " Good News " and " Lights Along the Shore " (two Baltimore imprints); a number of religious verses which were printed at the office of the Odd Fellow, Boonsboro', Maryland.

twenty dollars was offered, if fifty miles, thirty dollars, and if eighty miles, forty dollars.

Slaves

Three handbills give notice of runaway slaves. One, dated March 30, 1810, offered fifty dollars reward for a Negro man named Jack. The offer was made by Ananias Divers " near Wm. Patterson Esq'rs Mills, Gunpowder Falls." In another notice, dated Oct. 19, 1825, Thomas Snowden, Jr. offered one hundred dollars for a runaway Negro named Lewis. The third notice offered fifty dollars reward for a colored slave woman by the name of Easter. The offer was made by Jacob Woolery who described the negress as " rather between a mulatto and black, a short chunky, with thick lips and somewhat freckled in her face." At the time she disappeared she was wearing a light calico frock and an olive coloured cloth overcoat. Woolery offered twenty-five dollars reward if Easter was captured in the State and fifty dollars if taken up out of the State. This notice is dated Dec. 24, 1825.

A broadside, probably published in 1817, gives the " Constitution for the Government of the Maryland Auxiliary Society, for Colonizing the Free People of Color of the United States." The object of the Society, as stated in Article II, was " to promote and execute a plan to colonize (with their own consent), the people of color in our country, either in Africa or such other place as Congress shall deem most expedient."

At Cambridge, Maryland, on Sept. 27, 1858, H. C. Grieves had printed a circular letter which he sent out to the counties of the Eastern Shore suggesting that a convention be held at Cambridge to consider the frequent escape of slaves, the evils of abolitionism, and what means should be taken to abate these evils.[27]

One broadside, without date, has a " Sketch of the Life of Poor Old Moses," or Moses Johns, of Baltimore, who sold oysters during the winter and ice cream in summer. It was proposed that his tomb have the following epitaph:

> He followed a shocking cold business;
> He shelled out many an Oyster, and made many
> An epicure shell out the cash;
> At last Death shocked him and froze him to death.

[27] Data regarding the price at which slaves were sold can be found in a very large broadside dated Jan. 22, 1811, addressed " To the People of Calvert County," by James M. Taylor.

TAVERNS AND TEMPERANCE

Taverns

It is to be regretted that the Society has only two handbills of old taverns. One is a " Table of Rates," printed in Baltimore on March 30, 1779, by Messrs. Grant, McCandless and Stenson, who were the innkeepers. Wines, liquors and food were expensive; four pounds, ten shillings, for a bottle of madeira and two pounds, five shillings, for a quart of punch. A meal cost one pound, ten shillings. If any one " bespeak a bed," he must pay seven shillings, six pence for the same. Gentlemen were warned that they must take care of their own coats, whips, and spurs, as they would not be accounted for, if lost.

The other notice about a tavern is an advertisement of " Walter Slicer's Inn, Twelve miles east of Cumberland." On this handbill are given the distances from Slicer's Inn to Baltimore, Philadelphia and Winchester. This handbill has no date.[28]

Temperance

The earliest broadside, or handbill, dealing with temperance is the " Song of the Sons of Temperance," by Dr. J. E. Snodgrass, which was sung at their jubilee in Baltimore on the 4th of July, 1845. The chorus of this song follows:

> The draught we sing
> No pain will bring,
> Though thousand times we drain.

The draught referred to was, of course, cold water.[29]

[28] According to an advertisement on a broadside printed on Feb. 22, 1782, George Mann gave notice that he was going to take charge of the Indian King, on Church street, in Baltimore, which had lately been kept by a Mr. M'Hard. From a notice dated Sept. 18, 1823, of an " Election . . . of four delegates to represent Baltimore county in the General Assembly of Maryland," we learn of the location of taverns in that county at that time. There were twelve election districts in the county and in each district an inn was named where the voting was to take place. The notice is signed by S. C. Leakin, Sheriff of Baltimore County. In Baltimore, at about the same time, 1824, John Barr kept the Washington Hotel, on North Gay Street. See handbill entitled " Take Notice, the Friends of Philemon Towson, etc." Sept. 2, 1824.

A broadside was published in 1874 entitled " List of Members of the Senate and House of Delegates of the State of Maryland." The chief interest of this handbill lies in the list of hotels and boarding houses at which the members stayed during the session in Annapolis.

[29] There is also a large coloured certificate, dated May 20, 1850, of the Sons of

In a broadside, printed in Baltimore during 1778, a Dr. Thomas Bourk and William Frazier, both with the Army, reply to the charge that they had been drunk. They produced certificates of friends who testified that while both of them enjoyed the cup that cheers neither had ever been drunk while on duty. After completing his defence, Dr. Bourk took this parting shot at his calumniator, James Lloyd Chamberlaine, of Talbot county:

> Farewell, General; your cowardice and infamous proceedings render you so contemptible in my eyes, that, hereafter, publish what you will, it will only meet with contempt from Thomas Bourk.[30]

TRANSPORTATION BY LAND AND WATER

Roads

The Society has only one handbill which gives the rates which it was once the custom to collect at toll bridges. It is dated September 1817 and is reproduced herewith.[31]

While the following handbill more properly comes under the heading of "Crime and Punishment," it is considered here because of the information it gives about horse-drawn conveyances of many years ago. The notice, which is headed "Stop Thief. 25 Dollars Reward!" states that a sorrel mare had been stolen and that she was attached to "a Butcher Wagon with green body, blue shafts, and foot board, covered with white canvass; body resting on three springs, with iron axles, the nut on the right front wheel being smaller than the other three, no. 203." The owner of the horse who was William H. Weaver, a butcher, offered fifteen

Temperance stating that the Grand Division of the State of Maryland had made several men, naming them, a division of this temperance society. Next in date of publication is an item mentioning a meeting at Temperance Hall, North Gay Street, on August 29, 1853, where the delegates were nominated from Baltimore to secure if possible the passage of a "Maine Liquor Law." The evils of drink are emphasized in this broadside.

[30] This broadside was published on Aug. 18, 1778, by Mary K. Goddard. It is entitled "A Letter to James Lloyd Chamberlaine, Esq., of Talbot County," and is signed by William Frazier.

[31] The Society also has two old hand painted sign boards giving rates of toll. In the collection is another handbill, dated April 25, 1860, giving notice that an omnibus will be run on the Hillen Road between Bayne's Cross Roads, on the Joppa Road, and Baltimore. The fare between these two points was twenty-five cents.

Information about an old drawbridge in Baltimore over Jones' Falls is contained in two broadsides. One has the title "Samuel Chase and Thomas Chase—Deed of

RATES OF TOLL.

IN BALTIMORE COUNTY COURT,

September Term, 1817.

License is granted to Dennis A. Smith, proprietor of a Bridge over Patapsco River, at the place where Norwood's Ferry was heretofore established, to keep the said Bridge as a Toll Bridge, with proper gates and bars to secure the same, and to ask, demand and receive as toll for passage of said Bridge the following sums of money, to wit:

For all four-wheel Carriages, driver included,	**25 cts.**
For all two-wheel Carriages, driver included,	**20 cts.**
For Man and Horse,	**6¼ cts.**
For each Stage Passenger,	**3 cts.**
For each Foot Passenger,	**3 cts.**
For each Horse without a rider,	**6 cts.**
For Cattle, each,	**3 cts.**
For Sheep and Hogs, each,	**1 ct.**

Test: WM. GIBSON, Clerk.

TOLL RATES AT NORWOOD'S FERRY BRIDGE

From the Society's Collection of Broadsides.

dollars for the mare and wagon, and ten dollars for the conviction of the thief or thieves.[32]

Railroads

The most interesting handbill of a railroad, although the Society has only a photostat copy, is a notice of the old "Newcastle and Frenchtown Rail-road." To quote from the notice which was printed at New Castle, June 1, 1833:

PASSENGER CARS, propelled by a locomotive engine, leaves the Depot, at New Castle, for Frenchtown, every morning, upon the arrival of the Steam-boat from Philadelphia, at about half past eight o'clock, returning leaves Frenchtown at about half past ten o'clock.

Another train of PASSENGER CARS departs from New Castle, for Frenchtown, every evening, (except Sunday) upon the arrival of the afternoon boat, from Philadelphia, at about six o'clock, and on return arrives about nine o'clock.

Fare over the Road..... 50 cents
Do., for excursion over the road and back..... 50 cents.

R. H. BARR, Ag't.

This notice has a picture of the locomotive and train on which one took passage in those days.[33]

Cession, &c. to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore." The deed was made in 1818. The other broadside, dated July 26, 1847, is signed by Thomas N. Neilson and is addressed "To my Fellow Citizens of Baltimore."

The Society has a copy of the "Constitution of the Maryland Society for Promoting Internal Improvement." This organization was interested in "all matters connected with the construction of roads, canals, and other facilities of domestic commerce." On the same subject is another broadside dated Aug. 13, 1830, and addressed "To the Voters of the Eastern Shore of Maryland."

[32] This notice, which has no date, describes the sorrel mare that was stolen as having a "blaze face, long tail, heavy mane and fore-top, being nearly blind on account of having Moon Eyes."

About one hundred years ago Samuel Lyons, a veterinary surgeon, who lived on North Exeter Street, printed an advertisement in which he stated that he would "respectfully inform the citizens of BALTIMORE and its vicinity, that he now offers his services in the treatment of all the diseases incident to that noble animal the HORSE, as well as to CATTLE, the knowledge of which he has acquired by years of patient and laborious study. . . ." This broadside contains an account of the various diseases of the horse and how they could be cured. A picture on this advertisement shows how it was customary to truss up a horse for an operation.

One other item should be mentioned and that is a broadside dated March 4, 1836, entitled "An Ordinance to regulate the Inspection of Beef and Pork." This gives the duties of the inspector and his deputies.

[33] The original of this broadside is in the American Antiquarian Society. Broadsides giving information about other Maryland railroads can be found in the

Steamboats

A handbill, dated Baltimore, May 15, 1829, advertises the steamer *Columbia* of the Baltimore and Potomac Steam Packet Company. This boat left Baltimore on Saturday of each week for Alexandria, Washington, and Georgetown, returning to Baltimore on Wednesday morning. This ship, which was "upwards of 400 tons burthen," could accommodate one hundred passengers.

Another item about boats is a broadside giving both a picture and an account of the explosion of the steamboat "Medora" on the Patapsco river. The picture and the account appeared in "Dixon's New York Polyanthos," on April 12, 1842. The drawing of the explosion as well as that of the steamer *Columbia* are quaint indeed.[34]

Society's collection. One, dated Nov. 9, 1840, addressed "To the Citizens of Baltimore" has data about the Swatara and Good Spring Creek R. R. Co. See pamphlet entitled: *Charter of Swatara and Good Spring Creek R. R. Co.* (Baltimore, 1840).

There are three items which deal with the old Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad. One, printed at Annapolis on Feb. 29th, 1848, is a petition of the citizens of Cecil and Harford counties to the "Chairman of the Committee of Internal Improvements" in favor of permitting the railroad to have a drawbridge over the Susquehanna river; another, dated May 10, 1850, is addressed "To the Honourable the Mayor and Members of the City Council of Baltimore" and refers to the relations of the Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad with the York and Cumberland Railroad. The last item is a broadside issued by "The Sun" on July 5, 1854, containing an account of a railroad accident on the Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad near the Relay House.

The Society has an interesting lithograph of the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore Railroad during the winter of 1852 when freezing conditions made it possible to lay the tracks across the ice on the Susquehanna river at Havre de Grace.

A number of Baltimore & Ohio handbills, or posters, give information about the tariff rates on coal, lumber, livestock, merchandise and other freight. There are posters for the following dates: Jan. 24 and 26, March 31, 1863; Oct. 1, 1864; May 17, 1865; Mar. 19, 1866 and Mar. 18, 1867. There is also a broadside entitled "A Few Reasons in Support of the Annexed Plan for a 'Maryland State Bank' whose specific object shall be the completion of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad from the point of its present termination to the Ohio River." This broadside was published about 1854. The Society also has a copy of the "Centennial Gazetteer of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad" published in 1876. Although the latter is not a broadside, it is mentioned here for its interesting drawings of the old Deer Park Hotel and of the Queen City Hotel, in Cumberland.

Also relating to railroads is a broadside containing an advertisement of a "Snow Plough for rail and common roads." This handbill shows two drawings of the plow which was patented in April, 1859, by Willard Rhoads, of Baltimore.

[34] One broadside is entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Baltimore Steam Packet Company, 1839-1840." This company was organized to navigate not only the Chesapeake Bay, but also the Atlantic seaboard and any rivers emptying into that ocean.

Canals

The earliest item on this subject is a broadside, dated July 4, 1825, entitled the "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal no. 3," and addressed "To the People of Baltimore." This gives the advantages which would result from having this canal. In another small handbill, dated Sept. 12, 1826, Jesse Talbot, a candidate for Congress advocated this canal in his appeal "To the Voters of Baltimore City and County."

The advantages of building canals, including the Susquehanna canal, is the subject of a broadside signed "Jefferson," and addressed "To Stephen Watters, Esq." This broadside was probably printed in the year 1826. The same subject is referred to in a broadside dated August 31, 1826, which is addressed "To the People of Harford County," by John Archer.

The Society has two old bills of lading, dated May 14 and Aug. 25, 1836, which show the shipment of goods on Hand's Line from Philadelphia to Baltimore via the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.[35]

[35] Of a later date, April 1, 1866, is a handbill, or poster, giving the "Rates of Toll on the Susquehanna and Tide-Water Canals. . . ."

Mention has been made in this article of the fact that the Society has only two broadsides referring to taverns and only one about toll rates. There must be more in existence. The Society would be grateful if members of the Society, or others, would donate any such broadsides on these or any other subjects.

LETTERS OF SEVERN TEACKLE WALLIS, 1816-1894

By Frederick Down Scott, S. J.

Soon after the death of Severn Teackle Wallis, just fifty years ago last April, a Memorial Society was formed to perpetuate his name. His literary writings were republished,[1] and a statue erected in Washington Place. Speeches of tribute were delivered and recorded in the minutes of the various organizations, to which he belonged; especially in those of the Maryland Historical Society, of which he was President from 1892-1894. In the years that followed, those who knew him well, wrote in affectionate admiration of his eminence as a lawyer, humorist, and public figure in the city of Baltimore.[2] To increase familiarity with the character of such an illustrious citizen, it has seemed fitting to edit some of his unpublished letters. For it is through the knowledge of his personal letters, which were not meant for the public eye, and yet are of historical import, that a very significant indication of his vigorous and cultured character can be seen.

Mr. Wallis was born in Baltimore on Sept. 8, 1816, being the second son of Philip Wallis and Elizabeth Teackle. Both of his parents came of families long-settled upon the Eastern Shore of the Chesapeake Bay. At the age of twelve, he entered St. Mary's College, Baltimore. Nine years after graduation in 1832, he returned to give the commencement address and receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. The death of the Rev. Alexis Elder was the occasion which Wallis took to express his feelings towards this institution, now a Seminary: [3]

[1] *Writings of Severn Teackle Wallis*, Memorial Edition, 4 vols. (Baltimore, Murphy, 1896).

[2] W. C. Bruce, *Seven Great Baltimore Lawyers* (Baltimore, 1931); Bernard Steiner, "Seven Teackle Wallis," *Sewanee Review*, Jan.-April, 1907; Charles Morris Howard, "Personal Recollections of S. T. Wallis," *Daily Record* (1939).

[3] St. Mary's Seminary MSS, Baltimore.

Jan 24, 1871

My dear Fr. Dubreul:

A notice of the funeral of Fr. Elder, which I have just read in the Sun, has given me the first sad tidings of his death. I can not restrain the expression of my deep regret, that I should, thus, have lost the opportunity of seeing his remains deposited in the Calvary, where he sleeps among so many of my kindest and best friends. He was the only survivor of the large body of devoted men, who had charge of St. Mary's, when I entered the College in 1828, and was the last immediate link between me and the most cherished associations of my life. I have abundant and grateful memories, besides, of his encouraging kindness to me, from my childhood up, and the highest appreciation of his sturdy, simple, and associable nature. After so long a life of faith and purity and duty done, I trust that he has gone to a great reward.

Two months later he helped the Seminary in a professional matter concerning the sale of some of its property beyond Paca St. On March 22, he wrote: " I will do the best I can for those wretched but unreasonable people, consistently with the rights and interests of the Seminary. I have been dogged and persecuted by them, even more than you have, and have almost lost charity as well as patience." Incidentally, Mr. Wallis's brother, Samuel, died while a student at the College and was buried there Aug. 4, 1835.

Immediately after leaving college, Wallis studied law in the office of the celebrated William Wirt. We are fortunate in having preserved some very concrete advice of this law-mentor, which definitely influenced the habits of Wallis's life. On Aug. 25, 1833, Mr. Wirt wrote in part:

The fashion of the day calls upon you to cultivate this great, powerful, and wide-sweeping habit of thinking, and to go for strength and not for beauty. As connected with it, you must begin forthwith and persevere in treasuring up all sorts of useful knowledge. Mr. Jefferson was only sixteen years old when he began to keep regular files of newspapers, and to preserve every pamphlet on any public subject, which issued from the press. But beside these *collectanea*, there is a great field for personal observation, which must depend on your own sight and memory, and such minutes as you may choose to make of them in your private diary or common-place book.[4]

Upon the death of Mr. Wirt, Wallis continued his studies under John Glenn, later Judge of the U. S. District Court. All

[4] J. P. Kennedy, *Memoirs of the Life of William Wirt* (Philadelphia, 1850), II, 354-357.

through his life he maintained an intimate friendship with the Glenn family. Judge Glenn died in 1853, leaving a very valuable law library. His son, John,[5] was not a lawyer. Hence, he informed Wallis of his intention to dispose of the books. Wallis, therefore, wrote to him on Sept. 30, 1853:

The books which I said to Wilkins a few days ago, that I should like to have the use of till you disposed of your library were—Mason's, Garrison's, Sumner's and Story's Reports—being all of Judge Story's decisions and amounting to some 12 or 13 volumes in all. They are a valuable and important part of a good library—so much so that their absence might interfere with the value of the collection if sold as a whole. I only mention them to you, therefore, because you helped me so kindly last evening to do so. You will very readily understand, I am sure, how my indisposition to permit you to deprive yourself of what I know to be valuable to you, is entirely compatible with a perfect appreciation of your kindness and total absence of all unwillingness to reserve it.[6]

The Judge's older son was William Wilkins.[7] He was one of the proprietors of the *Daily Exchange* from 1854-1861, when it attacked the rising Know-Nothing Party through the vigorous editorials of Wallis. He was imprisoned in 1861, when his paper was suppressed by the government.[8] The intimacy of their friendship is best established by the following very jovial Christmas greeting of 1854.[9]

I am delighted with the picture, which is beautiful, in any light, and especially in that of your kindness, (no "half-light" at all) in which at this moment I particularly see it. I suppose I ought—but I cannot find it in me—to regret the expression of my liking for it, in your presence, which has made you deprive yourself of so capital a work of art, in its time. I have no hope that I shall be able to help you out, in like way, should you ever put on your wishing-cap, before me, but I trust that some fairy will do it for me, and that all good things and pleasant (such as will not be hurt by the fall), will come tumbling down the chimney, whenever the notion may take you to want them.

---

[5] John Glenn, Feb. 20, 1829-Mar. 30, 1896; with D. C. Gilman, he founded the Charity Organization Society, now the Family and Children's Society.

[6] MS in the possession of Philip Wallis, a grand-nephew of Mr. Wallis, of Philadelphia.

[7] William Wilkins Glenn, July 20, 1824-June 24, 1876; educated at St. Mary's College; lawyer; visited England during Civil War; member of the Wednesday Club.

[8] Sidney T. Matthews, "Control of the Baltimore Press during the Civil War," *Md. Hist. Magazine*, XXXVI (June, 1941), 154.

[9] MS in the possession of John M. Glenn, son of the addressee, of New York City. Wallis wrote on June 5, 1882, to congratulate him on passing the bar examination and to invite him and his friends to dinner.

By the by—you are a philosopher—does it not occur to you that our fairy mythology must have been sadly modified, if our ancestors had used furnace-flues or other calorifers of our day? Think of a fairy gift, or the blessed dame that sent it, coming out through a register, or landing in the middle of an air-tight. Imagine St. Nicholas emerging from a Latrobe-stove, or Cinderella's friend, with her wand, metamorphosing pumpkins, from the top of a range.

The subject is interesting and grows on one, but the sheet of paper does not. It leaves me room, however, without any supernatural machinery, to pledge you a happy Xmas.

Sincerely yours,

S. T. Wallis

It was, no doubt, due to his thorough knowledge of Spain and its language, as well as to his proficiency as a lawyer, that Mr. Wallis was selected by the Secretary of the Interior, Thomas Ewing, on September 22, 1849, for an important mission to Madrid. He was instructed by the Commissioner of the General Land Grant Office, Mr. J. Butterfield, to find manuscript material, which covered the question of a large Spanish claim, known as the Duke of Alagon Grant. This grant was alleged to cover the greater portion of the Peninsula of Florida. Ejectment suits had been instituted on the part of the grantees of the Duke against those who derived their title from the United States. In addition to this special case, the Department desired to procure all information in the archives of Spain and especially of the Council of the Indies. This information would throw light on the system of Spain in the granting of lands from the earliest up to the latest period in such of her former colonies as were then in the American Union, or which formed part of the U. S. territory. Besides this, any authoritative books, whether legal, political, or historical were sought. They would furnish facts that would likely prove useful in the future settlement of private titles, and in the future management of the public domain, which the government had recently acquired.[10]

Before sailing for Europe, Wallis wrote to the Solicitor of the Treasury, Ransom H. Gillett, from whom he had, also, received instructions: [11]

---

[10] Commissioner of G. L. O. to Wallis, Sept. 29, 1849; General Land Office letters concerning private land titles. National Archives.

[11] Wallis to Solicitor of Treasury, Oct. 6, 1849, MS, National Archives.

A day or two ago, I was called upon by Charles F. Mayer,[12] one of the counsel of the Hackley claimants, and himself largely interested in the title. He called to ask, whether it would fall within the scope of my duties to confer with him in reference to certain evidence, likely to be required in the trial cases under the Alagon grant. I told him that my duties were altogether confidential. He excused himself by saying that he had called under the hope of being able to save trouble and delay on both sides. There were certain facts, he said, of historical notoriety—such as the contents of the Spanish Constitution and the dates of its several promulgations and annulments—which, strictly speaking, would require formal proof, perhaps; but which could not be the subject of any disagreement. These the claimants were desirous to admit, and have admitted without further trouble. I replied that I had no authority to act in reference to any such matters.

I clearly inferred from Mr. Mayer's conversation, that the claimants are not in possession of strict proof, in regard to the matters referred to, and it may be desirable to furnish them no facilities by admissions, so that the government may be in possession of a good ground on which to force the claimants to a continuance, should any untoward impediment prevent the arrival of evidence from Madrid, in time for the trial of the cases.

Due to Wallis's diligent and thorough investigations, the evidence did arrive at Washington in time. The following in his report of March 27, 1850, to Secretary Ewing. This is only one of his communications to the different Offices involved, but it portrays best the manner and difficulties of his research. The other reports are mere routine. The substance of his findings is given in the following, and in his final report of April 1, 1850.

Mr. Barringer, by today's mail, encloses to the Solicitor of the Treasury, at my request, documents 19 and 20, being the Royal Orders and Cedula relating to the grants of Don Pedro de Vargas. These two documents complete the series contemplated by my instructions. I have procured duplications of them, which I shall retain, until I reach home.

The Minister of Grace of Justice, without any regard to courtesy or punctuality, postponed, until day before yesterday, the conclusion of the certificates which he had been so long preparing. He returned me, likewise, the Journals and Decrees of the Cortes, which he had had ready three months in his possession, informing me that I must go to the Keeper of the Archives of the Cortes for their authentication. In consequence of this, I shall probably be compelled to delay my departure for a week longer, as we are in the midst of the Easter solemnities, during which there is, if possible, less activity than usual in the public offices. The delay will not, however, be without fruit, as it may enable me to procure from the Widow Azaola some interesting portions of her husband's correspondence with Hackley.

[12] Charles F. Mayer, Oct. 15, 1795-Jan. 4, 1864; Baltimore lawyer and state

Yesterday I forwarded to Mr. Burton, U. S. Consul at Cadiz, to be sent to you, a box containing the works of which a list is enclosed. To all of them, except the merely historical works, I have already referred in my communications to you. Independently of the great historical merit of these last, they are valuable as containing maps, some of which (those of Florida) indicate the boundaries of the ancient *Intendencias* and may be of great service in determining jurisdiction in very old grants. The works themselves are so rare and desirable, that I shall be happy to be allowed to take them, should they not seem, to you, important for the purposes of the department.[13]

Another event of still greater national importance, the Civil War, summoned Mr. Wallis from the seclusion of his private law practice. His election as a delegate to the special session of the State Legislature on April 24, 1861, provided the only public office he ever held. The political events of this session, which preceded his arrest by the government on Sept. 12, 1861, have been amply related by himself.[14] His fourteen months imprisonment at Fort Warren, Boston harbour, caused him great physical suffering. Yet we find him trying to help the other prisoners by reading poetry to them, protesting by letters to the authorities about their great inconveniences, and distributing some thousand dollars' worth of clothing, which had been sent him by a friend.[15] A further description of his life is found in a letter to his sister, Elizabeth, dated Nov. 17, 1861:

I had your letters of the 12th and 13th night before last night. Yesterday I wrote to Mr. Pizarro. I am suffering still with my teeth and neuralgia. If the tooth-ache continues till night, I shall try the forcepts again. It is hard to lose old friends, but one can not lose sleep and all sorts of comfort. The weather continues clear, but cold and windy all the time, so that I cannot take exercises without great annoyance and pretty certain neuralgia.

The box, I suppose, will be here tomorrow. The removal or rather the release of one fellow prisoner, Mr. Williams, leaves only eight of us now in this room. You may very well imagine the latter number of occupants to be quite enough for a room 17 by 20 feet. You will therefore appreciate the relief which even the small amount of room thus lessened gives us. Mr. Williams will probably call and see John or yourself. He has

---

senator; as senator, he framed and had passed many laws governing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Co.; brother of Brantz Mayer.

[13] Wallis to Sec. of Interior, Mar. 27, 1850; Lands and R. R. Divisions, National Archives.

[14] *Writings*, Memorial Edition, II, 117-298.

[15] F. K. Howard, *Fourteen Months in American Bastilles* (Baltimore, 1863), p. 13; *Official Records of the War of the Rebellion*, Ser. II, vol. I, 714-715, 730.

been my room-companion since the second day after my arrival at Fort LaFayette, and can tell you all about me.[16]

The Mr. Pizarro referred to was Don Jose Antonio Pizarro, Spanish Vice-Consul at Baltimore. He had taught Wallis Spanish, while a student at St. Mary's. With him Wallis maintained a warm and lasting friendship until his death on July 3, 1877.

After his own release from Fort Warren, Nov. 27, 1862, Wallis returned to Baltimore to resume his law practice. Four months later Chief Justice Taney wrote: "I thank you for your birthday letter. Your approval of my conduct is most grateful to me; I know it is sincere, and comes from one who has had the best opportunities of knowing me, and who has himself given a bright example of public and private virtue amid severe trials." Hence, when the Maryland Legislature voted to erect a statue to Taney, following his death in 1864, Wallis was naturally on the committee to see to its erection. As chairman, he wrote to the four other members of the committee on Oct. 24, 1867:

Allow me to submit for your consideration the selection of Mr. Rinehart,[17] the distinguished Md. sculptor, now in Rome, as the artist to whom the work should be entrusted. Mr. Rinehart is a native of Carroll Co. and learned his trade as a practical stone-cutter in this city, where he developed artistic ability, which induced some liberal gentlemen to furnish him with the means of prosecuting his studies abroad. Although there but a few years, he has executed many works of very great merit and is now fully recognized as a sculptor of genius and great promise. I have several of his compositions, which I am sure it will give you pleasure to see. His employment will not only secure to us a work of art, which will be creditable to the State and worthy of its object, but will afford us an opportunity of encouraging and rewarding the talent of our own citizens. I have assurances, besides, that it will secure to us private contributions from gentlemen, who know Mr. Rinehart's abilities.

Very truly yours,

S. T. Wallis [18]

G. Frederick Maddox — Henry Williams
James T. Earle — Geo. M. Gill

On May 12, he requested Mr. William T. Walters "as one of Rinehart's earliest friends, to transmit the hope of the committee,

[16] Severn Teackle Wallis Papers, Peabody Institute Library, Baltimore.
[17] William S. Rusk, *William Henry Rinehart, Sculptor* (Baltimore, 1939).
[18] MS (copy) Wallis Papers, Peabody Institute Lib. Here, also, are three letters of Rinehart to Wallis concerning this statue.

that his engagements may not interfere with his acceptance of the commission." When the statue was unveiled in the Senate chamber at Annapolis, Dec. 10, 1872, Wallis was chosen to deliver the address. Later, in 1887, Mr. Walters himself donated a replica of this statue, which was erected in Mt. Vernon Place, Baltimore. There is a very long letter of Wallis to Walters printed in the *Sun* of Feb. 8, 1887. It deals with the absence from the ceremonies of Mayor Ferdinand C. Latrobe of whom Wallis had spoken very harshly in a previous campaign. Since Wallis was scheduled to speak on this occasion, Mr. Latrobe felt justified in not being present.

As Wallis was already, in 1874, the author of many fine poems when Richard Malcolm Johnston [19] first tried his hand at this literary form, he wrote to Wallis for a criticism of a poem entitled, "Wind of Winter Night." The following letters of Wallis to Johnston reveal a keen insight into the quality of the contemporary poetry of his day. Johnston published his poem in the *Southern Magazine* for March, 1874.

Jan. 25, 1874

I have not returned your poem before, because I hoped you would drop in, when I could tell you more intelligibly than I can write, what I wanted to say about it. I have not changed my opinion about its spirit, pathos, and absolute naturalness—as contradistinguished from what they call 'realism' nowadays.

On the contrary it has touched an old thing, or more, which I have supposed to be quite dried up, but have found to be this just a little—moist we will say—yet. I think, however, that you have not done it justice in some of your versification. I did not notice this, as you read it, because you read it well enough to bridge over, altogether, the occasional gaps that I seem to see in the measure, as I read it to myself. I am perhaps a little strict in my notions, for I never agreed, altogether with Poe's theory of measuring feet by the ear, without regard to actual measurement, and counting them, too, by the sound, without regard to actual numbers. I like as much accuracy—mechanical, if you call it so—in the versification and metre, as can be had. I am not reconciled to what is styled the 'freedom' of modern verse, in the hands of even the best masters. I tell you this frankly, in order that you may criticise my criticism. But I would, at the same time, ask you to go over the poem, particularly the latter part with a *detective* purpose, and see whether you do

[19] Francis T. Long, "The Life of Richard Malcolm Johnston in Maryland, 1867-1898," *Md. Hist. Mag.*, vols. XXXIV-XXXVI (1939-1941).

not think I am, to some extent, right. I shall be glad to compare notes with you, when you have done so.[20]

As the poem was published in March, the suggestions of the following letter arrived too late. It is worth quoting, however, as it contains a fine testimony to Wallis's love of social intercourse.

April 11, 1874

I received your note of yesterday and enclose your poem as requested. You will find a pencil-mark here and there, making a *grace* as to a syllable, or what has struck me as a chance of improvement. I am sorry I had no opportunity of outlining to you what I meant to suggest by them. That I have *no leisure* is unfortunately a fact, which, somehow or other, seems fated to be an unsurmountable one, and I never feel it half so annoyingly as when it interferes with my enjoyment of the social intercourse, which I desire more and more as the opportunities for it grow rarer and rarer. I should have been delighted to talk with you about your verses, as well as about other things, and I beg you to believe that I have felt, a good deal more than you, the disagreeableness of being compelled to lose the occasion you were kind enough to give me.

Your poem touches me very much, as I told you before. It recalls some things which perhaps everybody would not have occasion to remember—but I do not think poetry ever evokes these things, unless it is—poetry. Not knowing which of my little books you may desire to see, I send them both

In the fall of 1890 Johnston sought letters of introduction to the friends of Wallis, who lived in Bel Air, Harford Co., Maryland. The occasion was, no doubt, a public reading of some of his Georgia "cracker" stories, because in a brief note of Oct. 18th, Wallis wished him "clear weather and a good audience." The following letter is the reply to Johnston's inquiry:

215 St. Paul St.
Oct. 11, 1890

I have but few acquaintances in Belair, the most of those whom I knew well having passed to the . . . country.

It gives me pleasure, however, to make you acquainted with two or three, who may be of use to you, and whom you will, at all events, be glad to know. William Farnandis, the most cultivated of the three, is unfortunately very deaf, but he will, I am sure, be glad to serve you. Col. [Edwin Hanson] Webster I do not know at all intimately. He was a Maryland Unionist (converted) during the war and afterwards collector of this Port [Baltimore]. He is a man of form and a gentleman. Mr.

[20] This and the following two letters are from the R. M. Johnston Papers, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore.

Williams is a very fine young fellow, a promising lawyer and quite clever. Wishing you sincerely a pleasant and advantageous visit to the "rural district," I am

Very truly yours,

S. T. Wallis

Mr. Wallis was quick to realize the important cultural value of the erection of the Johns Hopkins University, in 1876, to the city of Baltimore. As President of the Atheneum Club, he invited Dr. Gilman and his faculty to be guests at a reception at the Club on Feb. 4, 1878.[21] Again, on Oct. 15 of this same year, while in the court-room, as an attorney for A. W. Perot & Co., he wrote President Gilman:

> It has become very desirable to my colleague and myself to have an analysis of the Demerara Sugar seized by the government made by Prof. R. L. McCulloh [of the University of Louisiana], who will be a witness for the defense. It could not be made as satisfactorily in this city, of course, as in your laboratory, but I presume that Prof. McCulloh would have some hesitation in seeking your permission for that purpose.

The University, being assured that it would be showing no partisanship by granting this request, gave its assent. No doubt it was to acknowledge Wallis's sincere interest. that President Gilman invited Wallis to deliver the seventh Annual Address, scheduled for Feb. 22, 1883. Wallis humbly replied on the fifteenth: "What I shall be able to say to you on the 22nd., at all worth saying, I do not at present see, so that you will please consider me as rather seeking to have as little time as you can arrange, left for my part of the performance." On April 13, he wrote asking for more copies of his address, which had been printed at the suggestion of Dr. Gilman. He had sent out all his own copies, so that he didn't even have one for himself. "You would be gratified to see how frequently my correspondents, in acknowledging copies I sent them, express their warm solicitude for the welfare of the University and their appreciation of the good it is doing and must do." Seven years later, June 5, 1890, he had to refuse to take part in the Commencement due to ill health, but wrote: "Please accept the expression of my sincere regret that I can not obey the impulse, which I always feel, to be

[21] The excerpts and letters quoted here are from the Daniel C. Gilman Papers in the Johns Hopkins University Library. See also Fabian Franklin, *Life of Daniel Coit Gilman* (N. Y., 1910), pp. 378-478, for another letter of Wallis on his notions of a library.

of use to the University, in whose prosperity I have so deep and abiding an interest." This formal association with the University led to a very intimate one with its President. Witness the following very human document:

Feb. 16, 1891

Dear Dr. Gilman:

I venture to carry out my threat of sending you, for your library, the very curious little book, which Verstegen calls, "A restitution of decayed intelligence in antiquities." I have had a good deal of fun out of it, now and then, during the long years that I have owned it. I dare say that you will find its quaint pedantry, half-learning, and credulous good faith accordingly entertaining. It has its serious merits, which, as a man of letters, you will appreciate, although its 'etymologies'—as the author calls them—are not quite up to the Johns Hopkins' standards of philology. I avail myself of the opportunity, as I wished to do, at the time, of expressing to you the great satisfaction with which I met you as a brother trustee of the Peabody Board.

Mr. Wallis's reluctance to hold political positions did not restrain his eloquent pen and voice from expressing his deep convictions on political questions. His own words best express the sense in which he is to be regarded as a "Reformer":

No one is less disposed than I to quarrel with party discipline and organization in their proper sense and legitimate and honest application. Indeed, without them, we all know that party existence could not be maintained. But the moment that they are deliberately and plainly perverted from their true purpose; the moment that the party is merged in the organization and the organ usurps the name and functions of the party, and commands instead of serving, the safety of the party no less than its integrity, demands revolt.[22]

The party in question here was the Democratic party. To fight successfully the "Ring," Wallis demanded something more practical than the fruitless slogan—"Reform within the Party." His opinion was: "I know no better or surer mode of breaking up the Ring than that of defeating its nominations all the time." [23] To this end he contributed frequently to the *Civil Service Reformer*, a paper which he founded together with Mr. C. J. Bonaparte in 1885.[24]

Fortunately, we have two other documents of his written just

[22] Wallis to J. Hall Pleasants, Mar. 21, 1885, Wallis Papers (copy), Peabody Institute Lib.

[23] Wallis to J. V. L. Findlay, Oct. 29, 1886, *ibid.*

[24] S. T. Wallis, *The Spoils and the Spoilers in Maryland* (Baltimore, 1887).

one year after the reform movement had begun in Baltimore.[25] They let us in, as it were, on the inside of the political maneuvers of those days:

Pavilon Hotel
Sharon Springs, Aug. 13, 1883

My dear John:

I am obliged to you for the little glimpses of politics you give me. Keyser [26] told me positively that he would not accept a nomination for any office. This was after the conversation, in which you told me he wished to be present. My decided conviction is that he would very much like and prefer to be Mayor, but that he feels as if to take the place, would seem to convict him of self-seeking in the reform movement. This, I allow, has been painfully mismanaged and abortive, and has practically come to grief, by distrusting its own strength, misrepresenting its purposes, and making truce with the devil. I feel every day more and more like taking a hand in the mêlée. I have advised Allison [27] to remain in the field, primaries or no primaries, and I am quite ready to take up his canvass, as soon as the time comes. If it is once thoroughly understood that he will run, he will be nominated. If he is not nominated and will run, the Republicans will support him and not nominate. He will be elected like a flash. I am booked for that fight, at all events, and if I could overcome my repugnance to being a candidate for anything, I would make things a little more "mixed" by announcing myself for Attorney generalship. I think I would at least damage these existing arrangements, if I did nothing more.

The story behind the following letter began on Feb. 19, 1883, when J. Monroe Heiskell was appointed fire marshal to take the place and perform the duties of the Fire Commissioners. Mr. Heiskell was the first and only incumbent of the office of fire marshal. The creation of the office occurred during the term of William Pinkney Whyte, as Mayor, and was involved in the political contests of the time. Political feeling ran high. It was charged that the old Board of Commissioners were conducting the Fire Department as a political machine, and graver charges concerning the methods of contracting for supplies were also freely

[25] Wallis to John Glenn, Aug. 13 and 22, 1883, MSS in the possession of Philip Wallis.

[26] William Keyser, Nov. 23, 1835-June 3, 1904; business man; never a candidate for a public office; 1883, Chairman of Democratic City Committee; 1885, in Reform League, of which he was president at the time of his death.

[27] Maj. Richard T. Allison, 1823-1909; born June 6 near Louisville, Ky.; practiced law in Baltimore; Paymaster of U. S. Navy; served in Confederate army during Civil war; clerk of Superior Court; died at Rockford, near Phoenix, Baltimore Co., Apr. 10.

made.[28] Later, in the fall, Mr. Heiskell was chosen by the Independent Democrats to run for Mayor. When Wallis lays stricture on Mr. Keyser and Mr. Summerfield Baldwin, he is not considering them as running for office, but as using their influence. Yet, it is strange that he should have done so, because both of these men were later very prominent in the reform movement. This letter is a sequel to the last one cited:

I agree with you that Allison does not stand the remotest chance, if he *goes* into the primaries, but my advice to him—Hurst [29] and I had a very full consultation on that matter—is to stay where he is, upon the nomination which he has accepted from the citizens and the bar, and run, nomination or no nomination from the party.

I am pretty well satisfied that in some shape or other, our friends Keyser and Baldwin have their understanding with Gorman,[30] and that the latter will consequently manage things in the main. It would be to smash such arrangements, and not to further them, that I should like to be young and strong enough to go personally into the fight. For I consider such a result as the reduction of last fall's movement [31] to a pitiful absurdity. I have had no knowledge of Keyser, personally, except since the movement of last fall began, and very little since then. I have been disposed to accept him as a straight forward man, and still desire so to regard him. But I cannot help feeling some doubts as to the entire frankness of his communications to me, when he voluntarily assumed to be frank. And then there is poor Heiskell, who, is a very honest fellow, whom I have advised and served in every way possible for the last fifteen years, and supposed to be absolutely loyal in his intercourse with me. I see that he has been letting out the idea in " interviews," that in dealing with the Fire Board affairs he acted under my advice. His object being of course to relieve Whyte of the responsibility of the proceedings, which resulted in making him chief mourner. Now I never saw Heiskell but once on the subject—the day before the disclosures were made in the Sun—and then he came to beg me to advise him as to whether or not it was his duty to make his discoveries public. I advised him without hesitation to do so, telling him at the same time that before he took a step he ought to state the whole case to Whyte, to whom he told me he had not mentioned the subject. Now, I perceive, he says that he never spoke to Whyte about it. Only the difficulty and reluctance I have in believing a gentleman, in his relation to me, to be guilty of a positive lie, prevents me from believing,

---

[28] Clarence H. Forrest, *Official History of the Fire Department of the City of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1898), pp. 106-107.

[29] John E. Hurst, Oct. 21, 1832-Jan. 6, 1904; business man; prominent in reform movement.

[30] Arthur P. Gorman, U. S. Senator and for many years leader of Democratic Party in Maryland.

[31] The New Judge Fight; the Independent ticket won on the issue of freeing the judiciary from political control.

now, that he came to see me at Whyte's suggestion, at the beginning. When I reflect that he had made the discoveries shortly after going into office, and did not think of disclosing them till after Gorman and Whyte had quarreled, my habit as a lawyer of sifting evidence renders it hard for me to keep faith in Heiskell unbroken—and yet I cannot consent, as yet, to surrender it. I have occasion to know from a close personal friend of Whyte's that he is "suffering great mental anxiety," and his suggestion of the technical deference that the repeal of the Fire Board ordinance repealed the penalty, satisfies me that he fears to meet the issue of fact.

But, I wonder, after all, why I bother myself during my holiday, or indeed at any time, with all or any of these things. Perhaps you wonder why I bother you, which would be quite natural I confess. Doubtless it is because disgust is like sorrow, which Hood says is like ale—that it is bettered by being poured "from one vessel into another."

In 1845 Mr. Wallis wrote a poem, entitled "The First Grave." It was dedicated to the memory of an infant, who was the first person to be buried in the Greenmount Cemetery. There, too, he was laid to rest following his death on April 11, 1894, after a full life spent in the generous service of his friends, and in the civic interests of his city and state.

ELIZA LAW

(Mrs. Lloyd Nicholas Rogers)

(1797-1822)

Miniature on ivory by unidentified artist, painted in 1814. Courtesy of the owner, Mrs. Wilfred P. Mustard, granddaughter of the subject. Inscribed on back by Mrs. Eliza Custis: "Picture of my darling child but not very like her." Photo by Frick Art Reference Library.

JULIA CALVERT

(Mrs. Richard Henry Stuart)

(1810?-1888)

Unfinished portrait painted in 1833 by Sully. Courtesy of the owners, the Hunter family of Winchester, Va., grandchildren of the subject. Miss Calvert was a bridesmaid at the wedding of her cousin, Mary Custis, to Robert E. Lee. Courtesy of the Clarke County Historical Association.

MADAME GRELAUD'S FRENCH SCHOOL

By Lucy Leigh Bowie

During the colonial period "female education" was often a matter of small importance. In many families the daughters got a smattering of the three R's in a catch-as-catch-can fashion but were carefully trained in needlework, deportment, and dancing. If they had access to a varied library, some attractive results were achieved with their "natural intelligence unhampered by education"; and if there was a tutor for the boys, they fared better for they could then study with their brothers, progressing as far as the tutor in question could or would advance them.

Schools for girls began to appear in the federal period. By the 1790's they were calling them "Ladies' Academies" and "Female Seminaries."[1] They increased in number despite the disapproval of the older generation who disliked the publicity of young girls having "Commencement Days," "Exhibits" and "Marching to Church." However, as late as 1809 there was a lack of really desirable schools for young girls in Maryland. A search of the old records reveals little concerning these early private schools, and only a few private papers remain to give us an insight into the lives of our ancestors as school girls. However, papers which have come into the writer's hands refer to Madame Grelaud's[2] French School in Philadelphia, located at 105 Mulberry Street, which was extensively patronized by the leading families of Maryland and elsewhere. Philadelphia was the largest city in the United States at that time and the only one that could boast of a cosmopolitan society. Obviously this was an advantage in the location of a finishing school[3] where many of the pupils came from plantation homes.

The information handed down by Madame Grelaud's pupils is that she was a native Frenchwoman and a refugee with the best

[1] John F. Watson, *Annals of Philadelphia* (1854), I, 289.
[2] Sometimes printed "Greland," the script "u" being mistaken for an "n."
[3] This term is of a later vintage, but it describes exactly the kind of school that Madame Grelaud opened.

connections. It has been said that her husband had a position with Stephen Girard, who was always kind to refugees. Her three sons Titon, Arthur, and John all became supercargoes on ships that belonged to Girard.[4] When Madame Grelaud opened her school in the first decade of the nineteenth century, she was a widow. She must have had immediate success for when the United States bonds to finance the War of 1812 were put on the market in February 1813, Deborah Grelaud invested $6,000 in them through Girard's Bank.[5] She is believed to have been a Huguenot, and her Biblical first name lends weight to that belief. The majority of those that are known to have been her pupils were Episcopalians, but there were also Roman Catholics and Sephardim Jews.

The first pupil connected with Maryland that we have any record of was Eliza Law,[6] who became Mrs. Lloyd Nicholas Rogers of Druid Hill, Baltimore. Her father, Thomas Law, placed her with Madame Grelaud on his way to Vermont in 1810. His wife was Eliza Parke Custis, a granddaughter of Martha Washington. The Peter girls, Columbia [7] and America, were entered also. They were the daughters of Thomas Peter of "Tudor Place," Georgetown, D. C. Their mother was Martha Parke Custis, also a granddaughter of Martha Washington. Caroline Calvert joined her cousins in November, 1812.[8] She was the daughter of George Calvert of "Riversdale," Prince George's County, a brother of the Eleanor Calvert who married John Parke Custis, Martha Washington's only son. Aside from these, who may be called the Washington connection, for it was so considered, the girls who attended the school at this period were: Matilda Edmondson,[9] daughter of Horatio Edmondson of Talbot

[4] Titon Grelaud, supercargo of the *Helvetius*, 1806-1807, and the *Rousseau*, 1809-1810. Arthur Grelaud, supercargo of the *Montesquieu*, 1810, and the *Voltaire*, 1815-1816. John H. Grelaud, supercargo of the *North America*, 1824. Harry Emerson Wildes, *Lonely Midas* (N. Y., 1943), pages 311-312.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

[6] Charles Moore, *The Family Life of Washington* (1926), p. 111.

[7] Correspondence in possession of Mrs. Henry J. Bowdoin: "I had not heard of Columbia's illness nor that her mother had gone to Philadelphia, how long does she mean to stay?" Columbia Washington Peter died December 3, 1820, unmarried. America Pinckney Peter married June 27, 1826, William George Williams, U. S. A. and died April 25, 1842. Kindness of Grace Dunlop (Ecker) Peter for genealogical record.

[8] *Maryland Historical Magazine*, September, 1943, page 269.

[9] Charlotte Matilda Edmondson married May 9, 1822, John Rousby Plater, son of the Honorable George Plater of "Sotterly," St. Mary's County, Maryland.

County, Maryland; Miss Magruder, who seems to have been a daughter of Denis Magruder of "Mt. Lubentia," Prince George's County, Maryland; [10] and Miss Russel, "daughter of Mr. Jonathan Russel" who was then in Paris.[11] Two of Stephen Girard's nieces were also placed with Madame Grelaud; Antoinette Girard entered the school in 1809 and left at the close of the term in August, 1812. Her younger sister, Caroline, was entered in November, 1812, and left in 1814.[12]

The school year began October 1st and lasted until August 31st with the month of September for vacation.[13] Each girl was required to bring with her a silver mug and teaspoon marked with her initials. They seem to us rather old for silver mugs and nothing is said of the traditional napkin ring. Perhaps it was still the fashion at that time to use the edge of the table cloth as a table napkin. An exaggerated formality was the fashion of the day. According to the books on behavior then prevailing, the pupils were *supposed* to address the principal of the school as "Honored Madam," to stand in her presence until told to be seated, and not to speak unless spoken to.[14] The pupils were never allowed to use each other's first names even when nearly related, but were always required to say, "Miss Smith," "Miss Jones," and so on. It will be seen later how they discarded this formality when teachers were not present to enforce the rules. In a limited degree, the girls were allowed to participate in "the events of the great world" as it was called. In fact, such participation may have been considered a part of their education.

It was a very expensive school, $500 a year; [15] and that charge for tuition was considered a remarkably high sum, as at that period board at a good hotel cost less than $200 a year; but they had the best instruction in French, drawing, music, and dancing, and parents were "quite satisfied with Madame Grelaud's School." Mrs. George Calvert, a highly cultivated woman with a

[10] Information kindly furnished by Mr. C. Baltimore Calvert and Mrs. W. Beall Bowie of "Mt. Lubentia."

[11] Warden Papers, Maryland Historical Society, Correspondence of Eliza Parke Custis, September 8, 1814.

[12] Wildes, pp. 197, 307-308. Antoinette Girard married John Hemphill of Wilmington, Delaware, April 14, 1814, died September 3, 1871. Caroline Girard married first, John Buckly Haslam, June 23, 1822, and secondly, Franklin Peale.

[13] *Maryland Historical Magazine*, September, 1943, p. 269.

[14] This was the time of the Regency when "Deportment" was held in exaggerated importance. America reflected the English fashion, in theory at any rate.

[15] *Maryland Historical Magazine*, September, 1943, p. 269. Wildes, p. 346.

European education,[16] thought so well of it that her daughters, each in turn, were educated there. Eliza Parke Custis wrote with enthusiasm of the success of her daughter's (Eliza Law's) education.[17] "She draws very prettily, indeed very well—plays and sings sweetly and will be a very good musician." The atmosphere must have been distinctly artistic for Caroline Girard won recognition both by her painting and her music.[18] Matilda Edmondson would at once be noticed by the elegance of her carriage, and there remains today a letter in schoolgirl French [19] as evidence that she made good use of her advantages.

There do not seem to have been many restrictions. The girls were not allowed to go into debt; [20] they could accept invitations and go to parties "under proper care," [21] and to the theatre. Play tickets were $1; carriage hire was 50 cents; and in June evidently for a long summer drive the cost was $1.50; a [horseback] ride 50 cents; a visit to the dentist cost $1; hair cutting, 25 cents; a bath ticket was 34 cents; and washing for three months cost $7.[22] In 1814, two dozen pairs of long white kid gloves and ribbons were ordered for Eliza Law from Paris. No dresses were ordered "because young girls all wear the same frocks." [23] These frocks were straight, narrow and short-waisted and were worn with coalscuttle bonnets.

The spring of 1814 was a period of anxiety and uncertainty on the Atlantic seaboard. The British Admiral, Sir George Cockburn, was blockading the coast from the Delaware Bay to the Charleston harbor. His marauding expeditions in the Chesapeake and the Delaware desolated the helpless towns of the waterside. No one doubted that Baltimore, Washington, and Philadelphia would be attacked. Under these circumstances, Mr. George Calvert decided to go to Philadelphia and bring his daughter home. There was some question of Miss Magruder also returning with him, but it is not known how that matter was settled. The main

[16] "Calvert-Stier Correspondence," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, June and September, 1943.
[17] Warden Papers, Correspondence, Eliza Parke Custis, November 9, 1814.
[18] Wildes, p. 258, 261.
[19] Correspondence in possession of L. L. B.
[20] Correspondence in possession of Mrs. Henry J. Bowdoin.
[21] Warden Papers, Letter of Eliza Parke Custis, November 9, 1814.
[22] Entries, account with Madame Grelaud. Unsorted papers in Girard College Library, 1809-1810. Kindness of Mr. H. E. Wildes.
[23] Warden Papers, Correspondence of Eliza Parke Custis, September 8, 1814.

roads were closed for safe travel, so Mr. Calvert had to go by way of Lancaster and cross the Susquehanna at Wright's Ferry. The roads were so bad that it was impossible to know when he would reach Philadelphia.[24] At home Caroline Calvert had a summer of continuous excitement. The British troops landed and marched through southern Maryland to the battle of Bladensburg (the Calverts' Post Office town). They then went on to Washington and set fire to the Capital City, which was only a few miles from the Calvert seat, "Riversdale."

Because of the threat to Philadelphia,[25] Madame Grelaud decided to remove her school to Germantown for the duration of the war. Eliza Parke Custis hastened from Washington and stayed with the Lears[26] in Germantown so as to be near her "beloved child" (Eliza Law), in those uncertain times; but they passed a peaceful summer in their semi-rural retreat. Peace was declared that fall, and Madame Grelaud brought her school back to Philadelphia in November.[27] She then located at 89 South 3rd Street, where she lived for ten years.[28] Caroline Calvert returned to school that same month and remained until the end of the school year in August, 1817.[29]

In 1824 or '25, Madame Grelaud bought a house in the next square at 102 South 3rd Street[30] and moved into it the first of May. She was still educating girls of the Calvert family, and the record is continued by a letter from Julia,[31] fourth daughter of George Calvert. It was written to a schoolmate, Eliza Leigh,[32] who had recently returned to her home in St. Mary's County. It reads:

[24] Correspondence in possession of Mrs. Henry J. Bowdoin.

[25] Warden Papers, Correspondence of Eliza Parke Custis, November 9, 1814.

[26] Tobias Lear was secretary to Washington when he was President of the United States. He was married three times. His second and third wives were both nieces of Martha Washington. At this time his wife was Frances Dandridge (Henley) Lear, and so was a near cousin of Eliza Parke Custis.

[27] Warden Papers, Correspondence of Eliza Parke Custis, November 9, 1814.

[28] Philadelphia Directories.

[29] *Maryland Historical Magazine*, September, 1943, p. 271. Caroline Maria Calvert born July 15, 1800, married June 19, 1823, Thomas Willing Morris of Philadelphia; died November 25, 1842.

[30] Philadelphia Directory and Julia Calvert's letter, presently.

[31] Julia Calvert was born at "Riversdale" about 1810. Married May 7, 1833, Dr. Richard Henry Stuart of "Cedar Grove," Virginia. Died June 8, 1888.

[32] Eliza Caroline Leigh, born June 25, 1810. Daughter of Honorable John Leigh of "Woodbury." Married Dr. Charles Llewellyn Gardiner of "Bramley" St. Mary's County, August, 1830. Died December, 1874.

Philadelphia April 26 [1824 or '25]

My dear Eliza

It is as you may easily suppose with great regret that we part from our sweet school fellow and *sister* Henrietta Kerr [33] her loss will never be replaced by any person whoever she may be or amiable either all my best friends will leave school very soon H. Kerr-V[irginia] T[ayloe] [34]-C[aroline] D[ugan].[35] Oh I must tell you the news Isabella Bell is married She is now Madame Herara Anita and Candelaria [36] seems to be delighted with the thought of having a brother in law. Johnston [37] is as cross as ever always getting in a persons light. Emma Chesnut [38] is mending her clothes Dea's' [39] are looking on with eyes and ears open Sparks [40] is ding donging at Washington's march Goldsborough [41] is talking as fast as her tongue can carry her V[irginia] T[ayloe] and C[aroline] D[ugan] are busily employed dressing H[enrietta] K[err] for a party. the rest are stepping about the floor. You may remember that Mr. J. Grelaud was expected when you were here and I suppose you heard of his arrival in this through the school he is called Prodigy I think he is quite enamoured with *H. Kerr* I believe the girls here adore him with all their hearts and he is nothing great after all on examination. . . . We expect to be out of this old house next week if nothing particular happens to prevent it Mrs. G bought it for her self so we shall get a scolding for every little cut or scratch that is found on it Holla! that will be nice wont it. I intend to carry some of the few ornaments that are on the chimney piece here as a rememberince of the nasty old place. . . . *Here* in Augusta Johnston coming with her usual sweetness of temper saying *You* LITTLE DEVILS you why don't you hush your tongues here she is praising up her sisters as usual and quarreling with us because we cannot or will not agree with her We gave Mrs. Grelaud a beautiful cake three pyramids high and a beautiful basket of Sugar Candy on the top the old lady seemed very much pleased at our attention but the best of the joke was that Johnston, Harden [42] and Tayloe would not put in for it and

[33] Henrietta Maria Kerr, daughter of Honorable John Leeds Kerr of Talbot County, Maryland, U. S. Senator from Maryland; married General Tench Tilghman of Talbot County, a grandson of Col. Tench Tilghman of Washington's staff. She was the mother of Tench Tilghman and Col. Oswald Tilghman of Easton. Her married daughters were: Mrs. Richard Burroughs, Mrs. Alexander Stewart Marye, and Mrs. Thomas Shreve.

[34] Virginia Tayloe was a daughter of Col. John Tayloe, whose home was the famous "Octagon House," Washington, D. C.

[35] Caroline Dugan was the wife of General Plesanton of Philadelphia.

[36] Isabella Bell, Madame Herara Anita, and Candelaria is unidentified.

[37] Augusta Johnston, unidentified.

[38] Emma Chesnut, unidentified.

[39] The Dea's' are unidentified.

[40] Miss Sparks, unidentified.

[41] Margaretta Goldsborough, eldest daughter of Nicholas Goldsborough of "Otwell," Talbot County, Maryland. She was the second wife of Henry Hollyday of "Readbourne," Queen Anne's County, Maryland.

[42] Miss Harden, unidentified.

they were not a little mortified when they knew that she found it out did you ever see such meanness however to come to end of my story she sent one night a large piece for each of us and they refused to take any *CONSCIENCE THUNDER STRUCK THEM* She lost 20 dollars of her sisters she pretends that she does not care any thing about it but *we all very well know* that she is frightened out of her wits that you my dear Eliza are sensible of Well I am sleepy and I have been gaping and looking at the lamp for ideas but I see no ideas—but smoke don't you see it (here is an impressionistic drawing of a lamp smoking) Oh do give me joy I have begun a new head lately You diable If did not congratulate me I will beat you My fingers are so tired I can hardly drag the pen along as you can see by the writing *howsomeever* I shall continue if I have to write with my Toes poor things they are pretty stiff also with cold as well as fatigued. every body is calling for paper to write to Eliza Leigh Henrietta Kerr has this moment gone out of here dressed for a ball she looks beautiful So good bye Eliza Leigh so good bye. Gale [43] has the gales [and is] squealing after me to tell you how Henrietta Kerr is dressed well she is dressed in a white frock and pink baux coral necklace and earrings pink ribbon to her belt tied before well what do you think of her . . . . .

Good bye child Yrs Julia
Calvert

It was addressed:

To
Miss Eliza Leigh
Leonard Town

Above the address was written " read this first you hear "

The pupils known to have attended Madame Grelaud's school in addition to those already mentioned were: Miss Dabney, who was a pupil between 1820 and 1825 and was undoubtedly a Virginian; [44] Miss Minis from Savannah, Georgia, who attended during the same years; [45] Sally Harris of Queen Anne's County, Maryland, and Miss Chase of Annapolis, daughter or granddaughter of Samuel Chase, the Signer. The last pupil of record was Elizabeth Black, daughter of Judge James Black, of New Castle, Delaware. She married Col. John Charles Groome of Elkton, Maryland and was the mother of James Black Groome, Governor of Maryland, United States Senator, and Collector of the Port of Baltimore.

[43] Henrietta Maria Gale was the ten year old daughter of Honorable Levin Gale of " Brookland," Cecil County, Maryland.

She probably left school at the age of 17 in 1833. The school was still in existence and listed in the Philadelphia Directory of 1849 as " D. Grelaud, female seminary," but no record has been found relating to this period. Good schools had been opened everywhere by that time and doubtless Maryland girls were being educated nearer home.

[44] Miss Dabney probably belonged to the line of Benjamin Dabney of " Bellevue " on the York River, King and Queen County, Virginia.

[45] Miss Minis of Savannah, Georgia, was a daughter of Isaac and Dwina (Cohen) Minis.

POLITICS IN MARYLAND DURING THE CIVIL WAR

By Charles Branch Clark

(Continued from Vol. XXXVIII, page 260, September, 1943)

THE ELECTIONS OF 1864 AND THE REVIVAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

The elections of 1864, state and national, were epochal in Maryland. They gave Lincoln's opponents a chance to register their hostility to Negro enlistments, armed interference at elections, and other Republican policies that had aroused much bitterness among conservative Unionists in Maryland. George Vickers wrote to Bradford that the Lincoln Administration had brought " chagrin, mortification and sense of injury " to the public mind.[1] He expressed a fear that many conservative Unionists would absent themselves from the polls in the fall elections because they were " so callous and dissatisfied " at the practises of the administration. Vickers said that if the Unconditional Unionists should alienate the Unionists " and the Democrats bring out a very strong man, and they usually rally at the sound of the Bugle, our success might well be questioned." [2]

The Democratic party, in fact, was staging a comeback in Maryland. It had never been dead in Southern Maryland but it had been totally suppressed in the rest of the State by Federal troops since 1860. In 1864 it was reorganized at Annapolis under the leadership of ex-Governor Thomas G. Pratt, Judge Richard B. Carmichael, Colonel John F. Dent, Oliver Miller, Oden Bowie, Daniel Clarke, Colonel James T. Briscoe and others. A committee was appointed in February, which later merged into a State Central Committee, to advance the interests of the Democratic party in the State. Oden Bowie, later Governor of Maryland, was made

[1] Vickers to Bradford, January 22, 1864, Bradford MSS.
[2] *Ibid.*

chairman of this Committee and A. Leo Knott was named secretary.[3] The Committee had some of the most distinguished citizens of Maryland as its members. It attempted unsuccessfully to prevent the legislature from authorizing a state convention, believing that the sentiments of the people would not be truly expressed. The Democrats desired to place themselves in full accord with the National Democratic party, asserting that it was the only safeguard of the rights, liberties, and interests of the people. These had been seriously menaced and they desired to erase the proscriptive features and political disabilities that had been imposed on the people of the State by the Republican party, and which they believed a new constitution would saddle upon them permanently.

On June 11, 1864, Secretary Knott issued the first official call of the Democratic party since the war began. Democratic voters were instructed to send five delegates from each of the city wards to a Baltimore City convention. This convention was called to choose a delegate to represent Baltimore in the Democratic State Convention, called under the same authority to meet in Baltimore on June 16. Both the city and state conventions were fully attended. Dr. John Morris, prominent physician of Baltimore, presided over the former,[4] while Colonel Oden Bowie was chairman of the state convention. A delegation was chosen to represent Maryland at the National Democratic Convention in Chicago on August 27. The nomination of General George B. McClellan was unacceptable to many in the Maryland delegation because of his connection with the arrests of political leaders in Maryland early in the war, but the State Democratic Convention ratified McClellan's nomination by a unanimous vote on September 29.[5]

The Unionists, meanwhile, were holding a convention in Baltimore to choose delegates to the National Republican Convention. The *Baltimore American* urged that only consistent and enthusiastic supporters of President Lincoln be chosen, and that those under the influence of Henry Winter Davis be kept off the ticket. " Mr. Davis has devoted his whole time in Congress to embarrassing

[3] A. L. Knott, *A Biographical Sketch,* pp. 11-31.

[4] *Ibid.* Among those present were William Kimmel, Albert Ritchie, J. A. L. McClure, Edward J. Charsty, Jr., John T. Gray, Joseph S. Heuisler, Augustus Albert, J. Q. A. Rolson, John Strible, Dr. Milton N. Taylor, Jesse Morrison, William Black, George F. Thompson, James E. Carr, Robert Renwick, William H. Perkins, James R. Brewer, and Samuel I. Smith.

[5] *Ibid.,* pp. 14-15.

the Administration, and his followers here are known to be equally embittered in their opposition to the nomination of Mr. Lincoln, though exerting themselves as pretended friends, to obtain place and power and office." [6] The *American* said that Davis' supporters had already obtained control of the State Central Committee, and would endeavor to be placed on the Lincoln Electoral Ticket. And, if successful, they would do all in their power to cripple Lincoln. There were two contesting delegations from Baltimore. Henry W. Hoffman, Collector of Customs and Chairman of the State Central Committee, was said to have "usurped the power" of giving credentials to one delegation.[7] The other set of delegates was elected by the Union City Convention, and according to precedent of twenty years, said the *American*, was entitled to represent the city wards. They "were regularly elected by a Convention called by the only recognized power in the City to call such meetings." Except in 1861, when political organization was confused, the city convention transacted the Union business of the city.[8] Just how this situation was straightened out is not clear.

After Lincoln was renominated by the Republican Convention in Baltimore in June, the *American* said that

> The wishes of the people have been duly respected and faithfully represented. . . . The nomination of Mr. Lincoln is nothing more than what all loyal Unionists expected and had a right to expect. It was simply an affirmation of their recognition of his distinguished merit. The popular affection for the President is a healthy sign. . . . Let us be animated by a spark of the wonderful, and overpowering enthusiasm and unanimity with which the Delegates were carried away yesterday . . . and the result next November will not be a doubtful one.
>
> The nomination of Andrew Johnson . . . for the Vice Presidency, is not merely a concession to the fact that Tennessee is still an integral part of the Union, and that her people have suffered for their loyal adherence to the Union as the people of no other state have suffered, but it is a just tribute to a patriot who stood firm in defence of the right when all around him were faithless to their trust. . . .[9]

The *American*, although representing the majority opinion in Maryland, overlooked the growing strength of the Radical Repub-

[6] *Baltimore American*, June 8, 1864.
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] *Ibid.*, Baltimore *Sun*, June 9, 1864.
[9] June 9, 1864.

licans, who nominated John C. Frémont at Cleveland for President. The Radicals in Maryland were led by Henry Winter Davis. Montgomery Blair was the spokesman for the conservative Republicans who desired the reelection of Lincoln. His activities in Maryland in 1864 were not as widespread as in 1860, but he made several speeches in the early months of the campaign. In general, the Radical Republicans met an unfriendly reception in Maryland and after September, 1864, the Lincoln forces gained strength.

But the Radical Republicans outside Maryland were not so easily squelched. On September 2 Governor Bradford was the recipient of an interesting communication from three New York editors: Horace Greeley, of the *Tribune*, Parke Godwin of the *Evening Post*, and Theodore Tilton, of the *Independent*. It read as follows:

> The undersigned have been requested by a body of influential Unionists to communicate with the loyal Governors for the purpose of eliciting replies to the following queries:
>
> 1. In your judgement, is the re-election of Mr. Lincoln a probability?
> 2. In your judgement, can your own State be carried by Mr. Lincoln?
> 3. In your judgement, do the interests of the Union party, and so of the country require the substituting of another candidate in place of Mr. Lincoln?
>
> In making these queries, we give no opinion of our own, and request yours only for the most private confidential use.[10]

Bradford replied that it was too soon after the nomination of the Democratic candidates to answer the first two questions with any degree of accuracy, but he thought he could " safely answer them both in the affirmative." He believed that the masses of the people were unwavering in their devotion to the Union and would regard all propositions for an armistice as a " practical surrender of the Union cause," and therefore refuse their support to any man who was a candidate on such a platform. In answer to the third question, Bradford said he believed

> that if Mr. Lincoln can *not* be elected, no other candidate presented at this period of the Canvass in his place *can*, and more especially so far at least as this State is concerned, one brought out under the auspices of the leaders most conspicuous in their objection to Mr. Lincoln.[11]

General McClellan formerly had many friends in Maryland but his military record turned many of them into opponents. Some

[10] *Maryland Historical Magazine*, III (1908), 176-178.
[11] *Ibid.*

said that it had become dangerous even to advocate his election in Baltimore. The "loyal public will not tolerate McClellanism in Baltimore, and many of the counties, because they look upon it with treason to the Republic." [12] And "if the government will deal more rigidly with the traitors in the Fifth District, the vote will be increased to six to one. The barbecues and public speaking have been assigned for nearly every day throughout the State from now till election day." [13]

McClellan, however, was not without support in Maryland. United States Senator Reverdy Johnson announced his support of him on September 14, 1864. Johnson said that he had opposed Lincoln in 1860 because he believed him unequal to the duties of the Presidency. And the manner in which he had met those duties in the past four years had confirmed him in those views. He believed that, through Lincoln's poor management, the Union was "even more effectually broken now than it was when his administration commenced." [14] Johnson thought that Lincoln, with the troops and resources at his disposal, should have long since suppressed the rebellion. But despite his "honesty of purpose," Lincoln had named one incompetent military officer after another, and then allowed them to engage in "vandal excesses," burning private homes and depriving people of their means of livelihood. Johnson thought that swapping horses in the midst of a stream was not generally a good practise, but "we should cast aside a spavined and thin horse, and secure a sound and active one." He praised McClellan's character, his refinement, his civil and military attainments, and above all his "perfect loyalty"; he would never "at all hazards" agree to surrender the Union.

A Union meeting in Baltimore denounced Johnson but admitted that those who knew him best were not surprised at his desertion to the Copperheads.

> A political trickster at all times, he has betrayed all parties that put him in power, and now his adhesion to the enemies of his country will only have the effect of forever damning him in the estimation of the

[12] Letter of "W. G. S.," a Baltimore correspondent to the *New York Tribune*, reprinted in *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, September 12, 1864.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Johnson made his announcement to a committee arranging a McClellan ratification meeting at Washington for September 17. Baltimore *Sun*, September 21, 1864; *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, September 21, 1864. The *Baltimore American* did not publish items of this character.

very few who believe him worthy of the confidence of the Union men of the nation.[15] [The meeting resolved that Johnson, a] leading member of the Democratic party, as once of the Whig party, . . . had been remarkable during his whole political life, for his Southern predilections.

He had betrayed North as well as South, for he first sanctioned the military rule of Lincoln and the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.

The *Baltimore American* rallied to Lincoln's defense. It claimed that McClellan was responsible for some of the interference and outrages in Maryland that Johnson laid at the feet of Lincoln. McClellan's instructions to General Banks at the time of the 1861 elections were cited as an illustration of this point. Since Johnson had supported Lincoln prior to 1864, the *American* asked: " Has he discovered that no more counsel fees are to be made out of the present administration, and that gratitude forms no part of duty when equivalent is rendered for value received? " [16]

Maryland was to elect a governor and lieutenant governor in 1864 as well as presidential electors. Bradford's term as governor ran until January, 1866, but the new Constitution of 1864 stipulated that his successor and a lieutenant governor should be chosen in November, 1864. The *Baltimore American* began at once to boost Thomas Swann, leader of the conservative Unionists, for Governor. Since the conservatives had cooperated in the framing of the new constitution, this journal felt justified in supporting their leader. It characterized Swann as " a man of energy and determination, one who has already given an earnest of his life executive ability, one whom we know will add life and vigor to the laws under the new era that is beginning to break upon us; who can and will do much for State improvement as he has done for the improvement and prosperity of our City." [17] Other possible candidates for Governor on the Union ticket were Judge Hugh Lennox Bond of Baltimore and Henry Howe Goldsborough of Talbot County, each of whom had a sizeable following.[18]

The State Union Convention met in Baltimore on October 18. It ratified the nominations of Lincoln and Andrew Johnson and

[15] *Baltimore American,* October 1, 1864.
[16] October 1, 1864.
[17] *Baltimore American,* September 22, 1864. Henry Winter Davis, formerly the *American's* ideal candidate, was now on its blacklist because of his opposition to Lincoln.
[18] Baltimore *Sun,* September 28, 1864.

chose presidential electors. The convention declared its determination to stand by Lincoln's administration "until this . . . rebellion has been crushed out, and every Rebel made to bow in submission to the Constitution and laws of the land, and every foot of territory brought under the dominance of the Federal Government." [19] The following candidates where chosen for State offices: Thomas Swann of Baltimore for Governor; Dr. Christopher C. Cox of Baltimore County for Lieutenant Governor; Alexander Randall of Annapolis for Attorney-General; and Robert J. Jump of Caroline County for Comptroller. Swann was nominated almost without contest, the other two possible candidates, Judge Hugh L. Bond and Henry H. Goldsborough, withdrawing their names. Daniel Weisel of Washington County was nominated for Judge of the Court of Appeals for the district composed of Allegany, Washington, Frederick, Howard, and Carroll counties. For Congress the incumbents in the First, Second, and Fourth Districts, John A. J. Creswell, Edwin H. Webster, and Francis Thomas, respectively, were nominated.[20] Colonel Charles E. Phelps was named for the Third District while Colonel John G. Holland was selected for the Fifth District. The Union newspapers of the State, led by the *Baltimore American*, supported these candidates heartily. The *Frederick Examiner* said: "It is enough to say, that as a whole, the ticket embraces 'nominations fit to be made,' and is one well calculated to initiate the new era of prosperity in which Maryland is about to enter." [21]

The Democratic State Central Committee met in Baltimore on October 28, chose its presidential electors and placed a full state ticket in the field. Judge Ezekiel F. Chambers of Chestertown was nominated for Governor; Oden Bowie of Prince George's County for Lieutenant Governor; Isaac Nevitt Steele of Baltimore for Attorney General; Colonel William P. Maulsby of Frederick for Judge of the Court of Appeals; and A. Lingan Jarrett of Harford County for State Comptroller. Benjamin G. Harris, the incumbent, was renominated for Congress from the Fifth District. At first no nominations were made for Congress in the other four districts, but it was finally decided to run a full ticket and Hiram McCul-

[19] *Baltimore American,* October 19, 1864.
[20] *Ibid.*
[21] October 26, 1864.

lough, William Kimmel, A. Leo Knott, and Andrew K. Syester were accordingly nominated from the first four districts. The Democrats also nominated a full ticket for the State legislature and for local offices.[22]

The perennial question of military interference came to the forefront again as the election drew near. George Vickers urged Governor Bradford to issue a proclamation protesting against such interference, but Bradford considered this " both unnecessary and inexpedient." He did not believe there would be any interference.[23] On November 4, Governor Bradford directed the attention of the judges of election to the fourth section of Article I of the new Constitution. It provided that " the Judges of Election, at the *first election held under this Constitution, shall* and at any subsequent election *may* administer to any person offering to vote," the oath of affirmation prescribed for voters. There had been a question whether this section applied to the 1864 election. Some thought that the first election meant that of October 12-13 in which the Constitution had been ratified. But Bradford declared that the November 8 election was the first, since the October election had been held before the Constitution was " adopted or proclaimed, and before the time prescribed by its own provisions for it to go into effect." [24]

About one third of the election judges of Baltimore City held a meeting and decided unanimously to administer the oath to all voters. This oath, however, was not to be taken as conclusive evidence of loyalty. Citizens were to be sworn to give true answers to any questions the judges might ask. A second and more largely attended meeting of the judges was held at the same place on November 7 to decide whether or not they had the right to commit for perjury, a question much discussed at the time. The judges decided to leave the matter to the discretion of the individual judge and to keep a list of rejected voters for future action.[25]

[22] *Baltimore American,* October 28, 1864; Baltimore *Sun,* October 28, 1864; A. L. Knott, *A Biographical Sketch,* p. 16; Frank R. Kent, *The Story of Maryland Politics,* pp. 9-10.

[23] George Vickers to Bradford, October 28, 1864, and Bradford to Vickers, November 4, 1864, Executive Letter Book, pp. 602-605

[24] Proclamation found in *Baltimore American,* November 4, 1864. See all issues of November 5 and 8, 1864.

[25] *Baltimore American,* November 8, 1864. The Baltimore *Sun,* November 5, 1864, and Knott, *A Biographical Sketch,* pp. 22-29, discuss the various phases of the subject. The latter denounces the application of the oath to voters as an

The election as a whole was a peaceful one. Few arrests were made, but many persons of questionable patriotism refrained from voting.[26] Maryland soldiers in the field were allowed, as they had been in the vote on the constitution in October, to cast their votes in this election.

Lincoln carried Maryland by a majority of 7,432.[27] His overwhelming majority over McClellan in Baltimore City, where he polled 14,834 votes to 2,766 for McClellan, won the Maryland election for him, for he had a minority of the popular vote outside the City.[28]

The Union Republicans made a clean sweep of the chief state offices. Thomas Swann defeated Ezekiel F. Chambers for the governorship by a vote of 40,579 to 32,068.[29] Other Republican nominees for state offices polled approximately the same majorities over their Democratic rivals. The *Baltimore American* asserted that since the Union, or Republican, vote has been larger than that cast for the Constitution on October 12-13, a gain had been made for the cause of Unionism and emancipation.[30]

The Democrats showed real strength in electing two of their candidates to Congress. John A. J. Creswell, Unconditional Unionist, was defeated for reelection in the First District by Hiram McCullough, Democrat, by a vote of 9,677 to 6,307. The *Baltimore American* pointed out, however, that Creswell had polled more votes than his District had cast for the Constitution. The First District was normally a Democratic stronghold. Creswell's victory in 1863 had been due largely to military interference and

attempt of the Republican party to maintain its power in the State, and characterized the judges' decision to ask questions of the voters as "inquisitions into his mind and conscience," and an act that "outraged all law and every sentiment of justice."

[26] *Baltimore American,* November 7, 1864.

[27] *Ibid.,* November 29, 1864. Lincoln's total was 40,171, including 2,799 soldiers' votes. McClellan had 32,739 votes with only 321 soldiers' votes included.

[28] A "Distinguished gentleman since high in the Councils of the Republican party and the country" reported to A. Leo Knott some time after the election that the Democrats actually carried the State in this election, and also defeated the Constitution in 1864, "but that the imperious necessity of the war . . . required the defeat of General McClellan and the success in a non-seceding Southern state of a Constitution which abolished slavery." See *A Biographical Sketch,* pp. 29-31. Knott, it is recalled, was a Democratic candidate for Congress in the Third District, but a former Unionist.

[29] *Baltimore American,* January 11, 1865. This is the vote as declared by the legislature on January 10. Swann was inaugurated in January, 1865, but did not take office until January, 1866. See also F. R. Kent, *The Story of Maryland Politics,* pp. 9-10; W. S. Myers, *Self-Reconstruction of Maryland,* (Baltimore, 1909).

[30] November 29, 1864.

his defeat in 1864 would indicate that there had been less interference in his behalf. Harris defeated Holland in the Fifth District by a vote of 8,839 to 3,389 for the second Democratic victory. Union candidates won by comfortable majorities in the other districts. Webster defeated Kimmel in the Second, 9,541 to 4,102; Phelps trimmed Knott in the Third, 9,313 to 1,753; and Thomas was reelected in the Fourth by a vote of 11,899 to Syester's 7,551.[31]

The Democrats secured a majority of two in the State Senate, electing thirteen members to eleven for the Republicans. But the Republicans had fifty-two members in the House of Delegates to twenty-eight for the Democrats. Baltimore City was unique in that it did not return a single Democrat to either House.[32]

Fortunately for the Unionists, William H. Holland,Democratic Senator-elect from Dorchester County, resigned on November 15 because of the pressure of private affairs.[33] A special election was held on December 23 to fill the vacancy, and Thomas K. Carroll, Unionist, was elected.[34] This created a tie vote in the Senate between the Union and Democratic members. Lieutenant-Governor Cox was in a position to cast the deciding vote.[35] On February 14,

[31] *Baltimore American,* November 29, 1864.

[32] Baltimore *Sun,* November 11, 1864; *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia,* IV (1864), 506. The membership was as follows:

Senate:

Unionists from Allegany, Baltimore County, Baltimore City (3), Carroll, Caroline, Cecil, Frederick, Talbot, Washington. Total—11.

Democrats from Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, Dorchester, Harford, Howard, Kent, Montgomery, Prince George's, Queen Anne's, Somerset, St. Mary's, Worcester. Total—13.

House of Delegates:

Unionists		*Democrats*			
Allegany	5	Anne Arundel	2	Prince George's	2
Baltimore County	5	Baltimore County	1	Queen Anne's	2
Baltimore City	18	Calvert	1	Somerset	3
Carroll	5	Charles	1	St. Mary's	1
Caroline	2	Dorchester	2	Worcester	3
Cecil	4	Harford	4		28
Frederick	6	Howard	2		
Talbot	2	Kent	2		
Washington	5	Montgomery	2		
	52				

[33] *Sun,* November 18, 1864; *Baltimore American,* November 18, 1864. Charges were made that Holland resigned because of intimidation by Unionists.

[34] *Sun,* December 12, 1864; *Baltimore American,* January 6, 1865.

[35] Cox was Maryland's first Lieutenant Governor, his position having been created by the Constitution of 1864. He was elected on November 8, to take office in January, 1865.

the Senate unseated, by a vote of 11 to 10, Littleton Maclin, Democratic Senator from Howard County, on the ground of disloyalty. His Republican opponent, Hart B. Holton, was declared elected.[36] Samuel A. Graham of Somerset County contested the seat of Levin L. Waters, Democratic Senator from that county, on the same grounds, but the case was postponed until the next session,[37] and was never decided.

The Unionists, or Republicans as they were now called, had in a period of months, aided by the Federal government, elected a state convention, framed a new constitution, abolished slavery in the State, made changes in the State government, helped to reelect Lincoln, and carried most of the State elections. They were naturally optimistic over their future. The strength of the reorganized Democratic party was not to be discounted, however. Its control of the State Senate and its victories in two Congressional Districts were important steps toward its return to power in Maryland. One of the Democratic leaders expressed his party's comeback as follows: "Thus was the Democratic party of Maryland after an interregnum of four years resuscitated, and started again on a career, which though marked in its earlier stages by trials and defeats, was destined in the end to be crowned with success." [38] In spite of test oaths, partisan election judges, and the supporting influence of the Federal army, the Democrats had indicated that the Republican control of Maryland could be shaken and possibly broken in the near future.

The newly elected legislature assembled on January 5 to hear Governor Bradford's biennial message. Bradford recommended that "some other time and tribunal than the day and Judges of Election" be provided, to determine who was entitled to vote under the new laws and regulations. He asked for full cooperation in perfecting the new free labor system in order that the rich natural resources of the State might be developed. The legislature was urged to iron out immigration problems and to encourage immigrants who were previously discouraged from settling in Maryland because of the slavery system.[39]

[36] *Maryland Senate Journal* (1865), pp. 115-117. For the testimony, see *Maryland Senate Documents* (1865), Documents E, G, and H.
[37] *Maryland Senate Journal* (1865), p. 342; *Maryland Senate Documents* (1865), Documents F, I, and L.
[38] Knott, *A Biographical Sketch*, p. 31.
[39] *Maryland House Documents* (1865), Doc. A; *Sun*, January 6, 1865; *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, January 6, 1865.

The Baltimore *Sun* called the message the " ablest of the many State papers that have emanated from our present patriotic Executive." [40] The *Frederick Examiner* praised Bradford's " statesman-like ability " and said

> we cannot refrain from congratulating the people of Maryland that, in the midst of the civil disorders which have so sorely affected us, it has been our good fortune to have at the helm so steadfast a patriot and able statesman as the present incumbent of the gubernatorial chair, to guide the ship of State through the dark clouds and mists which have enveloped us ever since the announcement of the rebellion. To this judicious administration are we deeply indebted for the brilliant prospects of the future, and when we shall have reaped the full fruition of our desires in the realization of the splendid career looming up before us, the conspicuous and noble part he acted in bringing about the grand result, will be reverted to with emotions of pride and heart-felt gratitude.[41]

The Legislature of 1865 ratified the Thirteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. The House of Delegates passed it by a large vote, but the Senate gave a strict party vote of 11 to 10.[42] Two important laws were also passed by this legislature. One removed all but two disabilities imposed on the colored population under slavery.[43]

The second important bill provided for the registration of voters in the State according to the requirements of the new Constitution.[44] This act, famous in Maryland's political history, formed the basis for most of the political strife during the remainder of the war. It provided that the Governor appoint three citizens " most known for loyalty, firmness and uprightness " as registers in each ward or election district. He was also to appoint three men to register the sailors and soldiers of the State. The registers were to enroll the names of all voters upon registration books. From these lists, entry on which was indispensable in order to exercise the right of suffrage, the registers were to exclude all disloyal persons. They

[40] January 6, 7, 1865.

[41] January 11, 1865. Despite Bradford's prominence in Maryland during the Civil War, he is generally not a well-known figure. James Schouler, for instance, assumes that Governor Hicks was in office throughout the war. *History of the United States*, VI, [1894] 48.

[42] *Maryland House Journal* (1865), pp. 120-122, 145; *Maryland Senate Journal* (1865), pp. 69-70; *Baltimore American*, February 2, 4, 1865; *Laws of Maryland* (1865), Resolution No. 5, pp. 406-407.

[43] This act passed both houses by large votes on March 24. *Laws of Maryland* (1865), Chapter 87, p. 136, Chapter 166, pp. 306-307.

[44] *Laws of Maryland* (1865), Chapter 174, pp. 322-330. Passed March 24, 1865.

might even refuse to permit persons who had taken the oath of allegiance to register. Ample powers were thus given the registers to exclude Southern sympathizers from registration.[45] This act was bitterly criticized throughout the State and was never effectively enforced.[46]

Acts of lesser importance provided for taking the soldiers' vote,[47] and for the prohibition of the sale of spirituous or fermented liquors in the several counties during election day.[48] Several futile attempts were made by the legislature to pass an act requiring corporation officials, educators, and others to take the oath of allegiance as directed by the new constitution.[49] The legislature adjourned on March 27.

The Maryland Legislature from April to September, 1861, was composed primarily of Southern sympathizers ready to carry the State into secession. But after the arrest of its disloyal members in September and the election of loyal members in November, the legislature settled down in December, 1861, to follow a program of adherence to the Union. The legislature passed stringent measures curtailing the liberties of the people, and its loyalty was questioned with some justification, but on the whole the wartime Legislature acquitted itself creditably. Governor Bradford aided the Legislature greatly with his practical suggestions and recommendations. The Unionists carried the November, 1865, elections, and Governor Bradford called for a special session of the Legislature to meet on January 10, 1866, so that Governor-elect Thomas Swann might begin at once the process of "self-reconstruction" in Maryland.[50] Swann, although elected as a Union-Republican, was not in sympathy with the Radical Republicans who gained strength in Maryland in 1866 and sought to limit the elective franchise in order to hold themselves in power. Accordingly, Swann began to cooperate with the Democrats and was largely responsible for that party's come-back in Maryland.

[45] See Bernard C. Steiner, *Citizenship and Suffrage in Maryland,* pp. 47-48.
[46] Myers, *Self-Reconstruction of Maryland,* p. 18 *et seq.*
[47] *Laws of Maryland* (1865), Chapter 124, pp. 187-189. Passed March 23, 1865. Polls were to be opened in each regiment or company at the quarters of the commanding officer.
[48] *Ibid.,* Chapter 191, p. 361. Passed March 24, 1865.
[49] *Maryland Senate Journal* (1865), p. 247; *Maryland House Journal* (1865), p. 39.
[50] For this story see Myers, *Self-Reconstruction of Maryland.*

AN ACCOUNT OF THE JOHN BROWN RAID

Publication in these pages of the study of Maryland politics during the Civil War by Lieutenant Charles B. Clark has reminded several readers of family letters which describe the experiences of their forebears in those troubled days. From Mrs. Robert R. Henderson (née Louisa Patterson) of Cumberland comes a letter written by Mrs. Charles Buckner Thurston, of Cumberland, to her mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Gannt, of Washington, D. C., in which she gives news of the John Brown raid on Harpers Ferry. Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Leiper Patterson, mentioned in the letter, were the parents of Mrs. Henderson, who were living at the time of the raid in the hotel at Harpers Ferry.[1]

Cumberland
October 20th, 1859

My dearest Ma,

I expect you have been anxious to hear from me since the commotions that have arisen between here and Washington—The Harper's Ferry *Insurrection.*

The facts seem greatly exaggerated in the newspapers, as I learned from many who were present during the excitement, and the number of the insurgents did not exceed forty. Mr. and Mrs. Patterson and the children were at the Ferry at the time. Mrs. Patterson says that all was quiet until the Cumberland train arrived at one o'clock, when from the constant whistling she thought that the cars had run off the track, and aroused Mr. Patterson who got up, and finding everything soon quiet, again went to sleep. Shortly after the Clerk at the Hotel came running up and asked if Mr. Patterson had a pistol and said some men were trying to get into the house and that the guard was already killed. The men who were trying to get in were the affrighted passengers who had just arrived, and the town was already in the hands of the Insurgents, without a citizen being aware of it, so noiselessly had the villains gone to work.

[1] See the references to this family in this *Magazine* for March, 1941, p. 50.

Soon the Chief came to the Hotel, said that their object was *not murder*, and that no one should be harmed if they did not resist them, but many were shot even on the suspicion of resistance, and about forty men confined in the Armory with the Rebellionists.. This was the reason that the citizens could make no resistance, because their friends and foes were together, and it was impossible to attack one without endangering the other, besides the enemy fired at them from loopholes in the Engine House. They went, about day, to Mr. Lewis Washington's farm about three miles distant, took, tied, and brought him to town, with his negroes whom they made join them. Mr. Patterson says that the negroes were frightened nearly to death, and one old fellow whom they told they had come to free, said "This country was good enough for him." Mrs. Patterson saw poor old Mr. Beckham shot, who had gone out to look at them and was unarmed. Mr. Patterson was with the prisoner Stevens, who, he says, behaved with the greatest courage, and begged someone to blow his brains out, fearing being mutilated by the soldiers. He expressed no regret at dying, said it was "one life for many" and that he had been led to believe the blacks are a persecuted race, and supposed as soon as the first blow was struck they would rise to arms, and they had no intention of robbing the Armory except of *arms*, and that their sole object was to free the slaves of Maryland and Virginia. He was a splendid looking man.

I thought something from an eye-witness might interest you. Mr. Patterson says that the pikes were made at the North, and that he saw one numbered over *six hundred* on the handle. These were to arm the negroes as they came in. Mrs. Patterson says that Stevens had the likeness of a woman and child around his neck and asked to see it when he supposed himself dying.

We heard of the commotion at Harper's Ferry here on Monday morning, but it was supposed to have arisen from some enemies to the Railroad. The Colonel [Charles Mynn Thruston, father-in-law of the writer] proposed to raise a hundred and fifty men in one hour to go down and see the cause of the riot, if they would let him have a train of cars, but the Directors of the road were *afraid* to consent to it. The Colonel curses them as cowards and said he would have been the first there.

Mr. Patterson had just deposited $400.00 in the Armory which was not touched. Was it not the most atrocious act of Abolitianism outrage?

With much love, my dear Mother,

Your loving child,

Rosalie

BOOK REVIEWS

The Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine: A Chronicle. Volume I: Early Years, 1867-1893. By ALAN M. CHESNEY, M. D. . . . Foreword by WILLIAM H. HOWELL, PH. D. . . . Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. xviii, 318 pp. $3.00.

The first of two volumes entitled *The Johns Hopkins Hospital and The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine—A Chronicle*, by Alan M. Chesney, merits a cordial welcome not only by physicians locally but by everyone everywhere who would learn in a most readable presentation of the conception and of the travail that gave to America the initiation of modern medical education.

As Doctor Howell indicated in his admirable foreword to the book, "It is a great good fortune that the task of compiling this history has fallen to the hands of Doctor Chesney for his connections with both institutions have been long and intimate." Thirty years of association as student, member of the Faculty and presently as Dean of the School of Medicine gave the author not merely personal acquaintanceship with many of the principals with whom he deals but an appraising and knowing interest in the birth and the evolution of the school and of the hospital alike. With the intellectual curiosity, thoroughness and balance of the scientific investigator, he has collated the true historical facts. With the style of one familiar with and adept in good composition, he has presented those data in an interesting narrative. The volume that has been published just subsequent to the fiftieth anniversary of the dedication of the School of Medicine presents the story from the incorporation of the University and the Hospital in 1867 to the dedication of the School of Medicine in 1893—the period during which "plans were made and principles and policies established that were to influence profoundly their future development." And an interesting story it is, telling in a facile style of the qualifications and aptitudes of the Trustees, of their prolonged and earnest efforts to choose the best consultants to guide them; of the cooperative endeavors of Doctor Billings, of skilled architects and of other professional advisers. In this volume, too, from papers hitherto literally buried in the Library of the University, the author gleaned the intimate details of the roles played by the men and the women to whose vision and work the fruition of the careful planning was brought about.

The well printed, well bound book is rich not only in facts concerning the School of Medicine, the Hospital and those who were concerned

directly with the creation and advance of them, but it presents as well an engaging picture of Baltimore of the period.

It is to be hoped that the second volume of this important historical work will be published in the near future, for with Volume One it will be read no more eagerly by all interested in the institutions than by any who would be informed of the history of medical education here and abroad.

CHARLES R. AUSTRIAN, M. D.

Album of American History: Colonial Period. JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS, Editor in chief; R. V. Coleman, Managing Editor; W. J. Burke, Associate Editor. New York: Scribner, 1944. xiii, 411 pp. $7.50.

The *Album*, following closely after an *Atlas* and a *Dictionary of American History* from the same editor and publishers, is a collection of many hundreds of pictures with only a few lines of text to a page. Gathered from a wide search of libraries, private collections and the resources of local societies the pictures are remarkably varied. There are houses and barns and churches and forts, interiors and furniture and furnishings, arts and crafts and agricultural processes, barbers and dentists and surgeons in action, costumes and customs, newspapers and broadsides, musical instruments and time-pieces. In range and variety it is worthy of high praise both for interest and for historical value.

It would be pleasant to add that the book is also worthy of high praise for its editing, text, and mechanical execution but unfortunately there are serious faults to report. The first and one of the worst is the absence of an index, leaving the reader or student in search of an item or a topical grouping no resource but to plod through the entire volume. Organization of pictorial material is never simple and the help of a good subject index is always necessary. The *Album* is organized by colonies, by two sections for the eighteenth century, and the Revolution. "The Self-Conscious Era" is the title for the period from 1750 to the Revolution; it covers a group of interesting and valuable pictures but they do not appear to have anything to do with growing American self-consciousness.

Although a number of the illustrations are reasonably good for these difficult times, too many are disappointing and some are very bad. The Old Treasury (p. 183) and the Brice House (p. 317) in Annapolis, the latter a splendid old mansion of mid-eighteenth century, are hazy and viewed from unfortunate positions. Moale's Baltimore in 1752 is at the other extreme, much too dark.

Picture titles and text are seriously inadequate, not only too meagre but often careless and misleading or inaccurate. In most cases too little data and explanation are provided for study or full enjoyment of the illustrations, far less than is provided in *The Pageant of America.* The Salem witches on p. 113 are burned (the hoary error seems incredible) and on p. 128 they are hanged. In the latter note Giles Corey is pressed to death but with the implication that this was the punishment for witchcraft, thus

missing a chance to give the instructive facts about why this punishment was inflicted and why the victim chose to incur it. The item on Margaret Brent (p. 195), the reference to religion and politics in colonial Maryland (p. 194), the almost meaningless reference to the Toleration Act in Maryland (p. 179), the note on the North Carolina Regulators (p. 364), the misuse of "connivance" on p. 375, the queer explanation of the Mayflower Compact (p. 42) are examples almost at random of the misleading or inaccurate. The portrait of Benjamin Rush (p. 332) presents him as merely one of seven "great doctors" of Philadelphia, missing a chance to give at least a few lines about one of the most alert and versatile minds of his time. Too many of the pictures lack needed documentation, or chronological placement, or proper warning to the reader, as in giving Paul Revere's engraving of King Philip (p. 108) without a hint that it is the product of the artist's fancy. Did the editor-in-chief fail to scan the copy or proof sheets?

The *Album* reflects the current interest in pictures and in social and cultural history and its materials are fascinating and valuable. Hence its defects are especially deplorable. In content it supplements *The Pageant of America* but the latter is superior in the quality of its reproduction and its scholarly care of editing. With all its deficiencies the *Album* will probably circulate widely and be genuinely uesful but it is earnestly to be hoped that subsequent volumes will receive the benefit of adequate editing and improved format.

J. Montgomery Gambrill.

The Johns Hopkins University

Observations on American Art: Selections from the Writings of John Neal (1793-1876). Edited with Notes by Harold Edward Dickson, Ph. D. (Pennsylvania State College Studies, No. 12.) State College, Pa.: 1943. xxvi, 115 pp. 75 cents.

John Neal receives passing mention in literary histories as a novelist of Byronic extravagance; in the literature of art he exists as little more than a faint shadow. A *retrouvé* of recent research, he now emerges from unjust obscurity a vivid figure of Yankee perspicacity, "the first to attempt anywhere a history of American literature," and the "first real milestone" in American art criticism, an enlivening and irritant force of a somewhat Mencken-like effectiveness.

Neal's observations on American art, written during the years 1823 to 1869, are a compound of signal good sense and much indiscriminate if lively chatter. It is the matter of the former sort that Professor Dickson has gathered together, in part from dim sources, and prefaced with a comprehensive, pointed, and very readable introduction which brings Neal's contribution into sharp focus in relation to the background of his times. The period of Neal's principal interest extends, roughly, from

1815 to 1830—years witnessing a considerable expansion in the outlook of American art, notably in the rise to honor abroad of such as West, Copley, Rembrandt Peale, Allston, and Morse, the acclaim in periodical literature of the achievement of American artists, and the professional encouragement given them by the instituting of annual exhibitions. As Professor Dickson points out, this was a generation to whom the fine arts meant principally painting followed by the associated graphic arts. Neal is no exception in having little to say of sculpture and architecture, though his remarks herein are both amusing and informative. Of particular interest to Baltimoreans are his judgments of the Washington and Battle Monuments, and his editorship from 1816 to 1818 of the *Portico*, vehicle of the Delphian Club. The selections deal at greater length with the more prominent names, like those just mentioned, with briefer attention bestowed upon some fifty odd others of lesser renown. Neal was thus no rival to his encyclopedic successor Dunlap, "the American Vasari," whose *History* appeared in 1834. Among the less luminous names, Neal has the honor of "discovering" Codman and Tilton, and another first is to be credited to him, we learn, his being the earliest praise of Poe as poet.

The body of Neal's comment resolves into penetrating sketches of artistic personalities (including a Leacockian parody on Audubon), and equally acute estimates, which have stood the test of time to a remarkable degree, of their creations. He had a keen eye, or "instinct," for what was genuine and what false or seeming fair, an adequate wit with which to debunk those who "had come to declaim, not to criticize," and his awareness of the sublime in art was conditioned by a shrewd sense of fact and plausibility. A prodigious student, self-taught, his remarks on occasion show evidences of age-old theory. The "general nature" of contemporary neo-classical portraiture had to be well supported by the "particular nature" of actuality and experience in order to satisfy his forthright scrutiny: ". . . how difficult it is to *copy* nature; how easy to *imitate* her." And in landscape "there is not a painter alive who dares to paint what he sees, *as he sees it*; nor probably a dozen with the power to see things as they are." Intermingled in his airy jargon are many a pungent comment and quotable passages of epigrammatic force.

Thanks to Professor Dickson's admirable presentation, here is a character who has been restored to his rightful place in the annals of American art. The effectiveness of the *Observations* is greatly enhanced by a list of condensed statements on the artists mentioned in the text, by an index, and by fourteen felicitous illustrations of works discussed by Neal.

EDWARD S. KING

The Walters Art Gallery

Archives of Maryland, LIX: Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, 1764-1765 (28). Published by Authority of the State under the Direction of the Maryland Historical Society. J. Hall Pleasants, Editor. Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1942. lxxiii, 482 pp. $3.00.

Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, 1764-1765 is Volume LIX of the Archives of Maryland, a series of colonial records published under the auspices of the Maryland Historical Society and of inestimable value to the student of American history. It is the fourteenth volume in the series to be ably edited by J. Hall Pleasants. His introduction not only provides a useful guide to the material in the text, with references to further information to be found in other volumes of the *Archives*, but also contributes to the understanding of the political history of this period. There is an interesting section on the members of the Assembly, giving the political affiliations of those in the Lower House and listing the number of lawyers who had received their training in the Inns of Court in London. The most avid student could not demand more intelligent and sympathetic aid from an index which is particularly generous in listing all the possible 18th century variations in the spelling of proper names. The Appendix contains seven rare contemporary documents which throw further light on the two most important events of these sessions, the increasingly bitter quarrel between the Proprietor and the people of the Province and the meeting of the Stamp Act Congress.

Many of the Proceedings and Acts of the Assembly in the two sessions covered in this volume illustrate the long struggle for power between the Proprietor, represented in the Province by the Governor and the Upper House, and the people of Maryland, represented by the majority of the members of the Lower House. Each proposed piece of legislation was scrutinized by the Upper House to see whether it would in any way diminish the Prerogative; an instance of the care with which they guarded the interests of the man who had appointed them to their well-paid posts was their refusal to agree to an act providing for the regulation of a market in Baltimore Town until the Lower House allowed the market employees to be chosen by the county justices. The Lower House, on the other hand, was able to prevent the Proprietor's increasing the amount of revenue he obtained from the Province by refusing to pass a bill to maintain correct standards of weights and measures until the provision that one-third of the fines for its violation should go to Lord Baltimore was removed.

The most able statements of the two points of view are contained, it seems to me, in the arguments presented by both Houses on the question of the payment of the salary of the Clerk of the Upper House. Tradition obviously was on the side of the Proprietary party who maintained that payment should come from the taxes as it had in the past. They stated that

The Use of Precedents must be perceived, when the Inconveniencies of Contention, which flow from a Disregard of Them are considered, . . . When we reflect, that the Intercourse and Privileges of the Members of Political Bodies, the Measures of Justice in Contests of private Property, the Prerogatives of Government, and the Rights of the People are regulated by them.

There is moreover a Reverence due to antient Establishments, adopted & confirmed by subsequent uniform Usage and a Modesty to be observed in opposing the Sentiments of Those, who have occupied the stations we are now placed in, with at least an equal Reputation of Ability, Integrity, and vigilance for the Public Good.

The answer of the Lower House was

. . . We should not have thought Precedent a Shrine at which the Rights of the People Comon Justice and the Principles of the Constitution ought to be sacrificed.

A tendency of the two Houses to disagree on the fundamental question of the relative importance of human rights and property rights appears in the arguments presented on a bill for the relief of "certain languishing prisoners" in jail for debt and in the "Act to prevent the Navigation on Potowmac River Monocacy and great Conicocheague Creeks being obstructed."

There is a brief reference in this volume to another group in the Province which was later to play an important part in helping to supply the requisite amount of disrespect for precedent and property rights necessary to bring about a successful revolution. It was composed of the frontiersmen in the back country whose threat to march to Annapolis "Armed with Guns and Tomahawks . . . to settle the Disputes betwixt the two Houses of Assembly in Relation to their passing the Journal . . ." caused consternation among the members of both Houses.

It may at first appear surprising that the conservative Upper House supported the Lower House in the measures adopted to bring about the repeal of the Stamp Act. But Mr. Charles Albro Barker in *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland* has pointed out that the Stamp Act was regarded as infringing on the Proprietor's Prerogative while Dr. Pleasants quotes in the introduction a letter from Governor Sharpe in which he explained to Lord Baltimore that if he had not summoned the Assembly for the purpose of choosing representatives from the Province to attend the Stamp Act Congress he was "convinced the Members would have been obliged by their Constituents to meet here even if I had not called them."

JOSEPHINE FISHER

Chesapeake Cruise. Edited by NORMAN ALAN HILL. Baltimore: George W. King, 1944. xv, 356 pp. $5.00.

"Mint Julep—Place mint leaves in 12 oz. glass with teaspoon of sugar and ½ oz. of water; muddle well until mint essence is extracted. Pack glass with shaved ice and, keeping outside of glass dry, jiggle until it frosts. Add 4 oz. brandy or whiskey and top with sprigs of mint dusted

with powdered sugar." I quote from the Appendix of *Chesapeake Cruise* (p. 333). Brandy or whiskey!

One would have expected in this book, a tale of "Four Old Men in a Boat" cruising in Maryland waters, a clear and uncompromising stand in favor of Rye. But no, Kentucky Bourbon, Maryland Rye, peach brandy, Cognac, rum—what you will. No choice is made in this most important matter; the editors have completely avoided making a selection.

Unhappily, the same apparent lack of any principle of selection is noticeable throughout *Chesapeake Cruise.* The book could have been, in my opinion, much better if the editor and his associates had selected the material more carefully and more strictly. Omission of most of the corny anecdotes, the poetry, and a few of the photographs might have been advisable. True and ardent lovers of the Chesapeake, the editors have gathered together an amazing amount of detailed information about tidewater towns and historic homes, cruising and fishing, history and legend, and the Bay itself. I reproach them only for being too generous.

Chesapeake Cruise is the story of an imaginary trip of about a thousand miles made by "Four Old men" in a thirty-foot sedan cruiser down the Western Shore and back up the Eastern Shore of the Chesapeake Bay. From the Severn to the James, across the Bay, up as far as Havre de Grace, then back to Middle River, the Patapsco, the Magothy, and the Severn again, our history-minded sailors explore every river and many a creek, tie up at every yacht club, and visit scores of historic towns and estates. They eat well, sample a few beverages, and exchange stories, both extravagant and informational. The crew of the *Fanny*, on the many actual cruises that constituted the practical part of the research work for *Chesapeake Cruise,* must have had a wonderful time.

Aware of the limited popular interest in books which are mere records of amateur sailors' adventures (Philip Rigg's *Southern Crossing* is the only one I have ever been able to read twice), the editor of *Chesapeake Cruise* planned his book as a combination log and guidebook, almost as a traveler's and sportsman's handbook of the Chesapeake. In order to make the book a source of much of the information needed by a traveler, special supplementary chapters on historical background, scientific subjects, and sporting events are included in the text and in the Appendix. Many well-known authorities on the Bay country contributed special notes and articles, among them, to name a few, William B. Crane, Hulbert Footner, Dr. Hugh H. Young, Dr. R. V. Truitt, Dr. Matthew Page Andrews, and Richard D. Steuart.

For everyone having an interest in the "finest body of water in the world for the yachtsman," and especially for all those who have personal post-war plans for exploring the rivers and creeks of Maryland and Virginia, *Chesapeake Cruise*, in spite of its weakness in organization, is certain to prove entertaining and useful.

RICHARD CARL MEDFORD

Baltimore Municipal Museum

Daniel Carroll, A Framer of the Constitution. By Sister Mary Virginia Geiger. Washington: The Catholic University of America, 1943. x, 210 pp. $2.00.

Daniel Carroll (1730-96), one of the few signers of both the Articles of Confederation and the Federal Constitution, has been a comparatively unknown figure in American history. This is due largely to the prominence of his cousin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and of his brother, Archbishop John Carroll. There has been, too, some confusion with the career of another relative, Daniel Carroll of Duddington. It is, therefore, appropriate that a full study of the man should be presented as a doctoral dissertation. The volume provides a reconstruction of Daniel Carroll's life on the basis of facts, using many original manuscript materials to supplement valuable printed sources.

The study is a solid, factual piece of work, well documented, and with full footnotes—not exciting reading, but a straightforward account written in clear style. It describes in detail the intricacies of the Carroll relationships and of Daniel Carroll's private and business affairs, then launches into a complete analysis of his work as a member of the Maryland House and Senate, the Continental Congress, the Constitutional Convention, and the first House of Representatives, and as Commissioner for the laying out of the Federal City. One gathers that every paper mentioning Daniel Carroll has been used somewhere, and quotations are supplied in numerous cases.

There are some minor errors which should have been caught. The inscription on the tomb of Eleanor (Darnall) Carroll, Daniel Carroll's mother, is misquoted (p. 11) to indicate that she died six years earlier than was the case. Eleanor (Carroll) Carroll, Daniel's wife, was Charles Carroll of Carrollton's first cousin, hardly "a distant relation" (p. 28); and she was her husband's second cousin, not usually regarded as a "very distant relation" (p. 31). Eleanor was the granddaughter, not the niece, of the Immigrant Charles Carroll (p. 39), and it was an uncle, Charles Carroll of Annapolis, who was particularly interested in her welfare (see p. 29). The author might be accused of overemphasizing Daniel Carroll's generous intentions (p. 52), for it is evident, from his own language, that he expected to make money from his lands. In the discussion of the struggle for ratification of the Constitution in Maryland, John Francis Mercer is named as the "most outstanding" of the defeated Anti-Federalist candidates, yet he is not listed with the others in the previous summary (pp. 149-50).

Sister Mary Virginia's work raises one or two questions which might be worth further study. John Hyde, London merchant, is given as the source of Daniel Carroll's first land purchase (p. 13), and in view of the fact that Capt. Charles Ridgely and others bought tracts from Hyde and his colleagues, it is interesting to wonder what part the merchants across the sea played in the establishment of Maryland's large estates. The

account books of several Maryland firms are cited for items purchased by Daniel Carroll (pp. 37-38), and the question naturally arises as to why he bought from them exactly the same sort of articles he was importing from England and advertising for sale in his store.

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

Fifty Years in a Maryland Kitchen. By MRS. B. C. [JANE GILMOR] HOWARD. Completely revised by FLORENCE BROBECK. New York: Barrows, 1944. 234 pp. $2.50.

Upon Mrs. Benjamin Chew Howard's famous cook book, *Fifty Years in a Maryland Kitchen*, first published in Baltimore in 1873 and now a "collector's item," Miss Brobeck has performed an adroit face-lifting operation intended to fit it to the needs of the stream-lined young housewife of today in her gay electric kitchen. It is a work involving piety and considerable toil, and it is hard luck that it should make its bow to the world at a moment when, thanks to food rationing, scarcity of servants, and other heavy trials, it is difficult or impossible to give many of the recipes a fair test. The final appraisal of the revised book, therefore, cannot be made until the return of days of leisure and abundance—an era whose dawn most of us are having difficulty in predicting.

In her sprightly preface Miss Brobeck rightly contends that in Mrs. Howard's book are to be found most of the recipes on which Maryland's reputation for good living is solidly based. However, she adds, "the author was sometimes guilty, with the overflowing larder on which she could draw, of using twice as many eggs as necessary, of adding cream when milk would have done as well, of calling for two or more fowls instead of one lone hen . . . and like all gifted 'natural' cooks of those days she cared little for accurate measurements, knew nothing of regulated ovens and wrote down a great many ingredients in obviously wrong amounts."

In substituting precision for vagueness, in giving exact weights and measurements, and in preferring the clock to intuition, Miss Brobeck has done an excellent piece of work. It is open to doubt, however, whether her premise that two eggs can do the work of four, or that milk can successfully pinch-hit for cream, is a sound one. The excellence of old-time Maryland cooking depended on the lavish use of prime materials of the finest quality. Cut down on these, and you purchase digestibility and economy at the cost of succulence and richness.

This opens up the question whether a revival of the Maryland *haute cuisine* can be successfully brought about at all. Mrs. Howard's best recipes were based on two other factors beside cheap and abundant foodstuffs: the willingness of the cook, or cook-mistress, to devote endless time and toil to the work of preparation, and the existence of diners with keen and discriminating palates capable of rising to appreciative enthusiasm for a culinary *tour-de-force*.

Everything in this slap-dash, cold-storage age of ours militates against these conditions. Whether there are servants or not, the artistic preparation of food depends on whether the mistress of the house herself knows how to cook and likes it. This calls to mind the groan of distaste given by a young woman who picked up a well-worn copy of the old cook book we are discussing. "'Fifty Years in a Maryland Kitchen!'" she exclaimed. "Can you imagine a more devastating description of a misspent life? I doubt if a recital of the story of Mrs. Howard's full and rewarding life would have caused a reversal of the young woman's judgment—certainly not the fact that she brought up a family of twelve children. If this represents the attitude of the present-day housekeepers, the stuff of which our meals are made will be determined, in the last analysis, by the Greek cafeteria proprietor, not by Mrs. Howard, and we shall gradually be drafted into the vast army of those who, knowing the better, have preferred the worse.

J. G. D. Paul

Through the Years at the Eastern High School. By a Committee of the Faculty. Baltimore, 1944. 237 pp. $2.00.

A hundred years ago come next November, Baltimore's Eastern and Western High Schools first opened their doors to a handful of wide-eyed young "females," pioneers in the publicly supported education of girls in the United States. This year, 1944, both schools are observing their centennial; and the book under review is a part of Eastern's contribution to that observance. It traces the progress of the school "through the years," bringing into the story a wealth of detail and collateral material which makes it a valuable addition to Baltimore's educational history.

The writing of the book has obviously been a real labor of love on the part of the authors: pride in the institution and its achievements blossoms out on every page. The style is informal and eminently readable; while the great mass of available material has been judiciously sifted and skillfully woven into a continuous narrative. Many pictures of people and places accompany the text, and complete statistical data are supplied in an appendix. In the appendix, too, are listed some 13,000 graduates of the school from 1853 through 1943—by years through 1890, and alphabetically thereafter in deference to feminine unwillingness to be "dated." A really ingenious compromise.

All in all, the book is a credit to the industry and editorial skill of the authors.

Eastern started its career on November 27, 1844, in three rooms in the second story of a house on the corner of Front and Fayette streets. David Ring was its first principal and sole teacher; and thirty-six pupils were enrolled. The enrollment increased rapidly, and new and successively larger buildings had to be provided at intervals. For thirty-six years (1870-1906) the school's home was the big building on Aisquith and

Orleans streets. In 1906 it moved into what was then the best school building in the city, at Broadway and North avenue. The present huge building on 33rd street was occupied in 1938. By 1939 the enrollment reached its peak of 2,391 pupils.

The first public commencement was held in October, 1853, with seven graduates from a three year course. The largest total number of graduates in any one year was 548 in 1942.

ERNEST J. BECKER

New Viewpoints in Georgia History. By ALBERT B. SAYE. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia Press, 1943. vii, 256 pp. $2.50.

When a publisher announces that a book offers a new approach and interpretation in the field of American history, the average reviewer immediately regards the assertion as a personal challenge to prove the claim is in error. In this case the challenge lies not only in the publisher's "blurb," but also in the title of the book. The present reviewer, whether average, or above or below par, feels no such ink-thirsty urge; in fact, having seen, in recent years, new interpretations of the colonial beginnings of at least two States of the original thirteen, he asks himself: "Why not Georgia?" and he goes further to question his own qualifications for reviewing a book based upon a deal of material he has had no opportunity to study, even though he was commended for the job by reason of some research which led to the modification of the treatment customarily accorded Georgia by certain American history text-books.

In short, the reviewer believes that the author of *New Viewpoints* has offered something worthy of careful consideration for further changes of treatment. Having but a limited space for comment, with unlimited limitations in first hand study, he would quote an intriguing part of the claim for the contents of the book in reference to the so-called charitable aim of the founders or projectors of the colony which, says the statement: "Soon extended wide enough to include not only the poor and unemployed of England in general, but also persecuted Protestants in foreign states as well," that, "only a handful of released debtors were ever sent to Georgia (a dozen would be a fair estimate)" and that, "the British Government, which from an interest in the defense of the frontier of South Carolina furnished four-fifths of the money spent by the Trustees, opposed migration at this time and permitted Oglethorpe's project to be carried out not because of, but rather despite, the prospect of poor and indigent persons being sent from England."

Granted that these new viewpoints in Georgia history are based on authentic sources and that the conclusions are justified, the volume may be said to lack that qualification for good narrative best expressed by the late Lord Tweedsmuir—the perhaps ornamental quality of readableness that can accompany historical writing. Hence one hopes that the author, who has done this tedious and difficult delving, will, in time, be so good as to popularize his findings.

MATTHEW PAGE ANDREWS

George Fitzhugh, Propagandist of the Old South. By HARVEY WISH. (Southern Biography Series.) Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1943. xiv, 360 pp. $3.00.

This survey of the creed of an ante-bellum Virginia editor, sociologist and spokesman for Southern reactionaries is based on articles and editorials in periodical and newspapers, chiefly in *DeBow's Review,* during the years 1849-1872. Glancing briefly at biographical detail, the author notes Fitzhugh's descent from William Fitzhugh, founder of this well-known Virginia family, but devotes most of his attention to the economic and sociological preachments of his hero. As a sort of opposite number to William Lloyd Garrison, Fitzhugh might have received a word-portrait.

How this apparently influential writer gained circulation for his ideas, extreme even for a Southerner of his day, gives rise to wonder. A sample from his book, *Sociology for the South; or, the Failure of Free Society* (1854) explains his outlook: "We would not exchange our situation for the countless millions of paupers and criminals who built up and sustain the cowardly, infidel, licentious revolutionary edifice of free society." Mr. Wish has rescued from oblivion a bigot whose doctrines long since arrived in the limbo of the forgotten—at least in America.

J. W. F.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England. By CLARENCE GOHDES. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944. 191 pp. $2.50.

Writings on Early American Architecture: An Annotated List of Books and Articles on Architecture Constructed before 1860 in the Eastern Half of the United States. By FRANK J. ROOS, JR. Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press, 1943. viii, 271 pp. $2.75.

Social Planning by Frontier Thinkers. By MATTHEW PAGE ANDREWS. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1944. 94 pp. $1.00.

The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943. By JAMES BENSON SELLERS. (Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. 26, No. 1.) Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1943. 325 pp.

The Centenary of the Cincinnati Observatory, November 5, 1943. (Publications of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio.) Cincinnati: Published by the Society and the University of Cincinnati, 1944. 63 pp.

Peter Melendy: The Mind and the Soil. By LUELLA M. WRIGHT. (Iowa Biographical Series.) Iowa City: State Historical Society of Iowa, 1943. 360 pp.

NOTES AND QUERIES

LEARNING THE HARD WAY

The centennial anniversary of the Morse telegraph, which has lately been observed, affords occasion for circulation of an article from *The Sun* of February 5, 1875, discovered by Mr. Louis H. Dielman, former editor

of this Magazine. This incident, as stated, was brought to light by publication of Scharf's *Chronicles of Baltimore*, which appeared in 1874.

ANECDOTE OF THE TELEGRAPH—A DEMOCRATIC REMINISCENCE

Hon. Hendrick B. Wright, of Pennsylvania, writing to Col. J. Thos. Scharf, in regard to some notice in his 'Chronicles' of Mr. Polk's nomination to the presidency of the United States at the Democratic convention held in Baltimore in 1844 says:

"In connection with this fact I wish to state to you an anecdote concerning the telegraph. At that date, May 29, 1844, the only telegraph in the United States was from Baltimore to Washington. I was president of the convention. We nominated Silas Wright as Vice-President of the United States, and the convention directed me to notify him of his nomination and learn if he would accept it. I sent a dispatch, and he answered immediately that he declined the nomination. The convention, however, refused to consider the information as authentic. They could not be made to understand this way of communication, and adjourned the convention over to the next day to enable a committee to go to Washington by rail, where Mr. Wright was, and get at the truth of the fact! So we adjourned over, and on the next day the committee came back with the same answer we had received by the wire! And so incredulous were the great majority of the body that after the final adjournment most of us went to the telegraph office to see the wonderful invention, and even when the wires were put in motion at our suggestion many of the delegates shook their heads and could not but think the whole thing a deception."

Pyburn—My great grandfather, Ennis Pyburn, was born in Maryland, and left there prior to 1810. He was living at or near New Madrid, Missouri, at the time of the great earthquake in the early part of the nineteenth century. Can any reader inform me in what county in Maryland he was born or lived.

A. M. PYBURN,
Slattery Building, Shreveport, La.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Dr. RAPHAEL SEMMES is a Maryland historian whose books, *Captains and Mariners* and *Crime and Punishment in Early Maryland*, are rated among the definitive works in their field. ☆ Now teaching at Loyola High School, FREDERICK DENT SCOTT, S. J., is in studies for the priesthood. He is a native of Baltimore and a graduate of Georgetown University. ☆ Miss LUCY LEIGH BOWIE, of the Prince George's family of that name, is a resident of Baltimore since her recent retirement from a research assistantship in the War College. ☆ CHARLES BRANCH CLARK of Ellicott City, now a first lieutenant of Marines in the Southwest Pacific, completed his study of Civil War politics a few years ago in partial fulfillment of requirements for the doctorate in history at the University of North Carolina.

Volume XXXIX Number 3

The Maryland Historical Magazine

1844 1944

SEPTEMBER · 1944

Controversy over the Command at Baltimore in the War of 1812 . . . *Ralph Robinson* 177

Civilian Defense in Baltimore, 1814-1815: Minutes of the Committee of Vigilance Edited by *William D. Hoyt, Jr.* 199

One Hundred Years of Electrical Communication in the United States . . *Frank B. Jewett* 225

A Maryland Tour in 1844: Diary of Isaac Van Bibber 237

Book Reviews 269

Notes and Queries 274

Published Quarterly by the
MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
BALTIMORE

5.00 the Year Single copy 75 c.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING

BOOKBINDING — FRANK W. LINNEMANN, 233 Park Ave.
Magazines, medical books, Old books rebound

BOOKS — NEW AND USED: BOUGHT AND SOLD
SMITH'S BOOK STORE — 805 NORTH HOWARD STREET
Established 1876

PHOTOGRAPHY — THE HUGHES COMPANY, J. W. Scott
213 West Monument Street, Baltimore

PHOTOSTATS & BLUEPRINTS — Baltimore Photo & Blue Print Co., 211 East Baltimore St.
Photo copying of old records, genealogical charts and family papers. Enlargements. Coats of Arms. LE 6881

PLUMBING — HEATING — M. NELSON BARNES
Established 1909 — Vernon 1646 — 807 N. Howard St.

STATIONERY, PRINTING & ENGRAVING
JOHN H. SAUMENIG & CO. — 229 Park Ave. • Baltimore
Lewis R. Curlett — Newton R. Haen

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Members of the Society are requested to solicit contributions of books, maps, portraits and manuscripts of historical value or importance, particularly such as may throw light upon the political, social or religious life of the people of Maryland.

The Society will become the custodian of such articles of the above character as the possessors may care to *deposit* should they be unwilling to give them, and will preserve them in the fireproof vault.

Any book or pamphlet written by a native or resident of Maryland or in any way relating to Maryland, will be gratefully accepted and preserved.

SIXTY-THREE YEARS

of dependable service

to the people of

Baltimore and vicinity

MONUMENTAL

STORAGE AND CARPET CLEANING CO.

SPECIAL VAULTS FOR ART OBJECTS AND SILVER: MOVING, PACKING, SHIPPING, FUMIGATING, RUG CLEANING, REPAIRING, LAYING

1110-1116 PARK AVENUE BALTIMORE, MD.

TELEPHONE SARATOGA 3480

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Buildings
201 W. MONUMENT STREET
BALTIMORE 1

OFFICERS: *President,* George L. Radcliffe; *Vice-Presidents,* J. Hall Pleasants, Laurence Hall Fowler, J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul; *Corresponding Secretary,* William B. Marye; *Recording Secretary,* W. Hall Harris, Jr.; *Treasurer,* Heyward E. Boyce; *Director,* James W. Foster.

THE COUNCIL: The General Officers and Representatives of standing committees—*Trustees of the Athenaeum,* G. Corner Fenhagen; *Publications,* Raphael Semmes; *Library,* L. H. Dielman; *Finance,* Charles E. Rieman; *Membership,* Mrs. Francis F. Beirne; *Addresses,* B. Howell Griswold, Jr.; *Gallery,* John H. Scarff.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION: *Chairman,* Raphael Semmes; J. Hall Pleasants; *Editor,* James W. Foster.

The Maryland Historical Society, incorporated in 1844, has been engaged in collecting, preserving and disseminating information relating to the history of the State. Through its services to scholars and others in making available collections of research materials, and through its publications, the Society has occupied and always should occupy an important place in the cultural life of Maryland.

Since 1906 the Society has published *The Maryland Historical Magazine.* There are monthly meetings from October to May, inclusive, at which addresses of a historical or literary nature are given. Those interested in the objects of the Society are invited to have their names proposed for membership. The annual dues are $5.00, life membership $100.00. Subscription to *The Maryland Historical Magazine* and to the quarterly news bulletin, *Maryland History Notes,* is included in the membership fee of five dollars, as well as the use of the Society's collections and admission to the monthly lectures. The library, portrait gallery and museum rooms, are open on every day of the week except Sundays.

The Society depends on the people of Maryland and its friends elsewhere for its maintenance. The gift of documents and books and donations or bequests to the endowment fund, have made it possible to build up a notable historical library. The collections include not only manuscripts dealing with the social, political and military history of the State, but also letters, diaries, business accounts, maps, newspapers, pamphlets, prints and photographs. Only by a continuance of interest in the Society will it be possible to preserve and catalogue its present collections and, of equal importance, to acquire new documents recording the rich history of the people of Maryland. In short, the usefulness of the Maryland Historical Society depends not only upon the number of its members, but upon their generosity as well.

The Magazine is entered as second class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under Act of August 24, 1912.

WILLIAM HENRY WINDER (1775-1824)

By Joseph Wood

Brigadier General, U. S. Army, from March 12, 1813, to January 15, 1815.
Portrait owned by his great grandson, John Henry Winder, Esquire.

MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXIX SEPTEMBER, 1944 No. 3

CONTROVERSY OVER THE COMMAND AT BALTIMORE, IN THE WAR OF 1812

By RALPH ROBINSON

That Major General Samuel Smith assumed command of the Army, gathered for the defense of Baltimore in September, 1814, at the instance of a committee soliciting his services, is well known, but the conflict of his authority with that of General William H. Winder [1] which followed is a chapter in military history hitherto unwritten.

When the British fleet sailed into the Chesapeake in August, bringing the army that later fought at North Point, Samuel Smith was the most conspicuous and one of the most distinguished residents of Baltimore. A major general in command of the 3rd Division of Maryland Militia with headquarters in that City, he was a veteran of the Continental Army who could proudly exhibit a sword voted him by the Continental Congress in recognition of his services. General Smith's interests, however, were not wholly centered on military affairs. Now sixty-two years of age, he represented Maryland in the United States Senate and, although a Jeffersonian Republican, was not accounted as a die-hard sup-

[1] In the United States pronounced as if spelled Wine-der. In England the pronunciation is Win-der.

The Winder MSS to which references are made are owned by The Johns Hopkins University which has courteously given the writer access to them. The Smith MSS referred to are the Samuel Smith papers in the Library of Congress.

porter of the Madison administration. Moreover, as the head of the firm of Smith & Buchanan he had been for a number of years extensively and profitably engaged in the shipping business—now, however, seriously interfered with by the War.

General Winder had been an officer in the army of the United States since April, 1812, when at the age of thirty-seven, he was commissioned a lieutenant colonel. Prior to that time his military experience had been limited to service in Baltimore as a captain of a company of militia. Born in Somerset County of a family that had its roots deep in the soil of that locality, he had obtained there both professional and political recognition when he decided in 1807 to move to Baltimore. Here his professional advancement had been such that when he entered the Army he was one of the leaders of the Baltimore bar and in the reception of an income that amounted to several times the pay of a lieutenant colonel of the army. In politics Winder was a Federalist, wearing the badge of the party opposed to the administration at Washington. His decision to enter the army must, therefore, be attributed solely to his desire to serve his country in a war which he believed to be inescapable and shortly to be declared.

Raised to the rank of colonel following the declaration of war by Congress in June, Winder had been ordered to the Niagara frontier in command of a force of less than 500 men recruited by him in Maryland.[2]

For conspicuous service there he was raised to the rank of brigadier general in the spring of 1813, but had the misfortune to be captured by the British in the Battle of Stoney Creek fought in June following and he remained a prisoner until June, 1814, when he was exchanged.

While a prisoner Winder instituted and brought to conclusion an exchange of prisoners which put an end to the degrading and inconvenient series of reprisals inaugurated by the administration when 23 American prisoners captured at the Battle of Queenston were threatened with death by the British government.[3]

This brought him in touch with the Madison administration and with Monroe in particular with whom an intimacy developed that remained unbroken until Winder's death.

[2] Winder to General John Dearborn. Winder MSS.

[3] The service performed by Winder in this connection is the subject of an article by the writer appearing in the October, 1943, issue of the *American Historical Review.*

When events in June, 1814, disclosed the probability of an attack by the British to be delivered in the area of the Chesapeake, the administration made preparations to meet it. For the purposes of military administration the United States had been divided into 9 districts, each in command of an officer selected by the War Department. It was now decided to create a new district to be known as the 10th in which Maryland, the District of Columbia and that part of Virginia which lies between the Rappahannock and Potomac River would be included.[4]

For the command of the new district in which lay Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis, and for the defense of which measures must now be taken, General Winder, just returned to military duty through exchange, was selected. Thus it came about that the American forces on the 24th of August, 1814, defeated at Bladensburg, were commanded by him.

Following that disaster, Winder established headquarters at Montgomery Court House and here assembled the remnants of the troops that remained in the vicinity.[5] These he organized and prepared to move to Baltimore which he anticipated would next be attacked by the British and to which he sent couriers with orders to provide food and munitions. On the morning of August 26th he set his force in motion and when he reached Snells Bridge on the Patuxent decided to leave it in command of General Tobias Stansbury and hurry on to Baltimore to bend the whole force of his power as commander of the 10th Military District to bring into activity all the resources of the place.[6]

Before reaching the city Winder was astonished to receive a letter by express from Major General Samuel Smith informing him that he had been called into service and had assumed command *according to his rank*.[7] This meant that from now on Winder would take orders from Smith, and if so, his position as commander of the 10th Military District in which Baltimore was included would be jeopardized and beset with all manner of confusion.

[4] The order creating the nine military districts was issued March 19, 1813. The new 10th District was created by order issued in July, 1814, and was carved out of the existing 5th District, which was made up of Maryland and Virginia. Niles' *Weekly Register*, IV, 65; VI, 319.

[5] Winder's statement to Congressional Committee investigating the capture of Washington. *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, I, 556.

[6] Winder to General John Stricker, August 25, Winder MSS.

[7] Smith to Winder, August 26.

In assembling the troops for the defense of Washington prior to Bladensburg, Winder had had a number of contacts with Smith and had found occasion to express appreciation of his cooperative efforts.[8] This cordial intercourse in the past served only to increase Winder's surprise and perplexity at the information imparted by his letter.

Smith had already given consideration to a possible conflict in authority between himself and Winder. Upon learning of the arrival of the British fleet in the Bay, he wrote to the Governor of Maryland, requesting to be informed what his rank relative to Winder's would be should he be required to call out the militia under the provisions of the State law. "The importance, and in my belief, absolute necessity of understanding the nature of our respective duties at this period," he wrote, "will plead my apology for asking of your Excellency instructions for my government."[9] In reply the Governor tactfully wrote:

> The Secretary of War, I understand is of the opinion that no officer of the United States, be his grade ever so inferior, is to be commanded by a militia officer of any grade, unless he (the latter) is in the service of the United States, according to which opinion, you, while commanding a Division under authority of the State, would be subject to the authority of an officer of the United States if you were circumstanced so as to be compelled to act together.[10]

While the Governor asserted he was not in accord with this view, he did not, he said at present wish to give a stock opinion and would write Smith further. Smith's inquiries he said "led to a subject in which he had long foreseen difficulties would some day arise probably of serious inconvenience to the public service." And here the matter rested for the time being.

Whatever information General Winder may have had as to this correspondence, immediately upon his reaching Baltimore on the evening of the 26th of August, he wrote the Governor asking for a confirmation of Smith's claim.

Now the Governor of Maryland was Levin Winder, the General's uncle whose affection for and interest in his nephew is displayed in the letters that passed between them. In reply to the General's inquiry the Governor wrote:

[8] Winder to Smith, July 21. Smith MSS.
[9] Smith to Governor Levin Winder, August 18. Smith MSS.
[10] Governor Winder to Smith, August 18. Smith MSS.

Yesterday, I received a letter from Mr. Johnson [Mayor of Baltimore] as Chairman of a Committee, stating that they desired General Smith to take command at Baltimore and that I would invest General Smith with further powers. I returned for answer, it was proper for General Smith to take command of the militia and make every arrangement for the defense of the place, but that I could not invest him with any powers which he did not already possess except to inform him that according to the requisition of the Government of the United States for a Major General, he had been selected for that purpose, but certainly this information was not contemplated to give General Smith command nor neither could it take effect in any respect until confirmation was given to it by the General Government.[11]

Before disclosing the next move made by General Winder it is necessary to review the incidents preceding the letter sent to the Governor by the Mayor of Baltimore to which the Governor makes reference.

On the day preceding the Battle of Bladensburg there had been formed in Baltimore a general Committee of Vigilance and Safety made up of representatives from the wards and the areas known as "The Eastern Precincts" and "The Western Precincts." At a meeting of this Committee, held on the day following Bladensburg, a sub-committee of which Col. John Eager Howard, the hero of Cowpens (whose son had served as aide to General Winder at Bladensburg) was chairman, was appointed to wait on General Smith and to request that he would at this important crisis take upon himself the command of the forces that might be called in defence of the City. The sub-committee acted pursuant to a communication received by the Committee of Vigilance and Safety from Brigadier General John Stricker, Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry, Major George Armistead of the regular U. S. Army serving at Fort McHenry and Master-Commandant Robert T. Spence of the U. S. Navy, attached to the command of Commodore John Rodgers, in which they expressed the wish that Major General Smith be requested to take command at Baltimore.[12]

[11] Governor Winder to General Winder, August 27. Winder MSS.

[12] See text of original minutes in this issue, p. 199 ff. Perry was in Baltimore in connection with the building and equipment of a vessel intended for his command. That Armistead should have been one of the signers of the letter to the Committee of Vigilance was a breach of military etiquette, to say the least. Armistead, serving at Fort McHenry, was under Winder's command.

The sub-committee headed by Colonel Howard, after waiting on General Smith, reported that he would take command, but that he wished to be sanctioned in so doing by the Governor and that "his powers might be extended." It was pursuant to this request that the Mayor of Baltimore wrote the Governor.

What the Governor wrote Smith did not contain the limitations as to Smith's command expressed in his letter to his nephew General Winder. It was as follows:

> By request of the President of the United States of the tenth of July last, one Major General is requested of this State. In compliance to which you have been selected.[13]

"The request of the President" refers to an order issued by the War Department on the preceding fourth of July establishing the militia quotas which the several states were requested to raise for possible service in the war, that for Maryland being 6,000 men, one major general, three brigadier generals and staff officers in addition.[14]

Such militia as were under arms in Maryland had been called into the service of the United States by an order issued by General Winder prior to Bladensburg and the capture of Washington, but it did not include Major-General Smith or any officer higher in rank than brigadier general.

Governor Winder's letter to Smith, above quoted, was sufficiently cryptic to serve Smith's purposes and those of the committee. They construed it to mean that he too had now been called into the service of the United States in the rank of major general, by the Governor by virtue of an authority conferred under the order of July 4th.

Being a man of action and a senator of the United States, Smith did not refer any doubts as to his status to the Secretary of War. Instead he took the bull by the horns and boldly wrote him that he had been appointed by Governor Winder to the command of the quota of Maryland under the General Order of July 4th and had assumed the command conformable with his rank. "General Winder is in the City," he added, "I have not yet seen him. . . . My force may be called 4000 effectives. I am throwing up field work." [15]

[13] Winder to Smith, August 26. Smith MSS.
[14] *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, I, 550.
[15] Smith to Armstrong, Secretary of War, August 27. Smith MSS.

In this fashion technicalities were brushed aside and Smith became *de facto* commander in chief at Baltimore.

He was, we are told, "soon . . . on horseback, traversing the City and animating his fellow citizens to buckle on their arms and to prepare to defend their homes and all that was dear to free men." [16]

Stiffening the resolution of his fellow citizens was a need of the hour, for there was a feeling abroad that the wisest plan was to buy off immunity from attack, as Alexandria had done when Captain James Gordon's squadron dropped anchor before that city. Opposed to this craven counsel resolutely stood such men as Colonel John Eager Howard, who is reported to have declared that he had four sons in the field and as much property at stake as most persons, but would see his sons slain and his property reduced to ashes than so far disgrace his country.[17] Happily the decision was to resist and happily too the names of the appeasers are wrapped in a merciful oblivion.

To Winder there appeared to be a way out of the difficulty created by Smith's assumption of command and this he now decided to pursue. He wrote to John Armstrong, the Secretary of War, and suggested that he be raised to rank of major general in which as an officer of the regular army he would "out-top" Smith.

Stating that he had sent to Smith a copy of Governor Winder's letter to him,

> he, to my astonishment, [wrote General Winder], still conceives himself in command and persists to exercise it. The manner, [he continued], in which General Smith has placed himself in command in my absence is at least very singular. The immediate and peremptory decision of the Government which can only give me necessary support to enable me to act with effect, is absolutely necessary and although I have never pretended to urge pretensions to increase in rank, yet I submit it now; for the readiest mode of avoiding all difficulty will be giving me a rank to overreach

[16] From a prepared statement in the Smith MSS. It cannot be overlooked that there was a solid basis for having Smith take over the defense of Baltimore, quite aside from his competency to command. Ever since April of the preceding year where construction of the different works for the City's security was begun, they had been under the supervision of Smith acting as major general of the 3rd Division of Maryland Militia and credit for their progress and effectiveness on September 12th cannot be denied him. See Scharf's *Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), p. 341 *et seq.*

[17] Daniel C. Gilman, "Colonel John Eager Howard," in *Launching of a University* (New York, 1906), p. 383.

the possible danger of conflict with any militia officer—as will also to give me the most decisive evidence of the countenance of the Government at this perilous and difficult moment.[18]

If precedent could be relied on, Winder had reason to believe that this proposal would be hospitably received by the Secretary. On an earlier occasion he had decided a priority in rank in Winder's favor when the question was raised by the pretensions of Major General Van Ness of the District of Columbia militia. He then held that when those troops were called into the service of the United States their division commander was not included unless it was specifically so stated.[19]

But that was before Bladensburg.

Armstrong now had troubles of his own which no doubt absorbed his full attention. The responsibility for the defeat of the American forces in that engagement was chiefly saddled on the Secretary, although Winder was included in the censure.

The former was charged with indifference to any disaster that might befall Washington, the choice of which for the national capitol, it was claimed, he had always opposed, and Winder whose appointment as commander of the 10th Military District Armstrong had opposed " was reprobated as a Federalist and a fool." Thus were assailed in these few words both his fealty to the Administration and his military capacity.[20]

Armstrong's response to Winder's request to be raised to the rank of major general was evasive. His letter, he said, had been submitted to the President and " the course which under pressure here is thought advisable, is that you return to this place with the regular infantry as soon as possible and that you turn off General Douglas and his Brigade from the route to Washington." [21]

Pursuant to this order, dated August 29th, Winder proceeded to Washington. However, in the brief interval between the 29th and the 31st of August incidents of momentous importance to the Secretary of War had transpired in Washington. These will now be reviewed.

[18] Winder to Armstrong, August 28. Winder MSS.

[19] For an interesting account of this controversy see *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, I, 581-2.

[20] Charles J. Ingersoll, *Historical Sketch of the Second War* (Phila., 1845), II, p. 170.

[21] Armstrong to Winder, August 29. Winder MSS.

Following the withdrawal of the British from Washington the President and Monroe had returned on August 26th to find the City and Georgetown in a state of great confusion and alarm. Captain James Gordon with his squadron of the British fleet that had been sent up the Potomac when Admiral Cochrane left the mouth of that river for the Patuxent, was at Alexandria of which he had taken possession, and the seizure of Washington and Georgetown was momentarily expected.

Armstrong, Secretary of War, was still in Frederick, Maryland, to which he had fled when Washington fell to the British and Winder was in Baltimore. Prompt measures were indispensable. In the circumstances the President requested Monroe to take over Armstrong's portfolio and also military command of the District of Columbia. Complying with the request, Monroe found himself Secretary of State, Secretary of War and in active military service with a combination of duties and responsibilities never before and never since in the history of this country assumed by a member of the cabinet.

On the morning following the assumption of his command, Monroe in company with the President and Mr. Rush, the Attorney General, had visited the Navy Yard, and the arsenal at Greenleaf Point and had adopted measures under sanction of the President for the defense of the city and Georgetown.[22]

The assumption of a command in the army was the realization of an ambition cherished by Monroe from the outbreak of the war. After the defeat of Hull, Madison had offered him the command in the northwest, but Armstrong had, unknown to the President, slipped in the appointment of Harrison. At the close of the campaign in the fall of 1813 it was again suggested that he take the field but finding that it meant service under Major General John Dearborn he expressed preference for his cabinet berth.[23]

[22] S. M. Hamilton, ed., *Writings of James Monroe*, V, Appendix, p. 374. It was while exercising this command that an officer was ordered from the field by Monroe for insubordination. This officer has mistakenly been identified in D. C. Gilman, *James Monroe* (American Statesmen Series), as General Winder. See index sub-nom *Winder*. At the time the incident occurred Winder was in Baltimore.

[23] Hamilton, *op. cit.*, V, Appendix, p. 374. The story of Monroe's military ambition is told in a letter to Thomas Jefferson. *Ibid.* What capacity Monroe would have displayed as a general officer is pure conjecture. His military command in the District of Columbia was too limited and too brief to furnish any information, but his service in the Continental Army found a severe critic in Aaron Burr. "He

Thus when John Armstrong returned to Washington from Frederick on August 29th he found his post of Secretary of War occupied by Monroe and military command of the District likewise committed to him. Whatever misgivings this situation may have created for Armstrong they were soon resolved.

On the afternoon of the very day of his arrival he was visited by the President who, after reviewing the situation, including the responsibility for the defeat at Bladensburg, succeeded in making it very clear to his Secretary of War that his usefulness in the cabinet was at an end. Armstrong left Washington at once for Baltimore where the next day he wrote out his resignation and forwarded it to the President.[24]

Thus it happened that when General Winder, pursuant to the order of Armstrong above mentioned, arrived in Washington on August 31st, he found his friend Monroe not only Secretary of War, but exercising command in an area included in his own. Nevertheless, he issued a general order stating that headquarters of Military District No. 10 were now established in Washington to which returns and communications should be directed unless his movements otherwise required.[25]

Reviewing this change in the situation, Winder now decided that he would submit to Monroe the confusion attending the assumption of command by Smith and ask the relief that he had not succeeded in getting from Armstrong.

He accordingly drew up a summary of his activities covering the period of his services in the 10th Military District and on September 1st submitted it to Monroe together with a letter in which he said:

> I beg leave simply to say that it is due me in justice and it is due the Government that they should give me the most emphatic support. If they omit to take that step now at every subsequent misfortune, however inevitable, they will be obliged to change their commanding officer and thereby deny themselves the possibility of executing any subsequent plan for defense of the Country at this perilous moment.[26]

pretends as I am told," he wrote, " to some knowledge of military matters but he never commanded a platoon nor was ever fit to command one." Burr to Governor Alston. Parton's *Life of Andrew Jackson*, II, p. 351-2. Burr's opinion of Monroe's legal ability was no higher: " As a lawyer Monroe was far below mediocrity. He never rose to the honor of trying a case of the value of a hundred pounds." *Ibid.*

[24] Gaillard Hunt, ed., *Writings of James Madison*, VIII, 300-304.

[25] Winder MSS.

[26] Winder to Monroe, Winder MSS.

But Monroe was not sufficiently moved by this appeal to gratify his friends's wishes. Baltimore had selected the man it wanted to assume the defense of the city. The enemy was on its way to attack it. This was no time to encourage disunity.

On the day following receipt of Winder's letter, Monroe wrote Smith giving him recognition as commanding officer in the Baltimore area and informing him, " that General Winder will unite with your forces such of those under his command as may afford the most efficient aid to the protection of Baltimore." [27]

This settled the question as to who was to command at Baltimore and Winder returned to that city on September 4th, but his letters clearly disclose his perplexity as to the part he was to have in the plans for its defense.

In the afternoon of that day he wrote Monroe that Smith had intimated the idea of giving him a brigade " patched up from other Brigadiers who may go away "; but as yet had issued no order and may possibly out of 12,000 or 14,000 men, give him such command as he would be entitled to as senior officer except himself, but as to his views and intentions he was wholly uninformed.

I deem it, [he continued], my duty to give immediate regular notice of my situation to the Government. It is obvious that the idea of my being still commander of the 10th District after your order of the 2nd must be perfectly nominal not only here but every where else and that I may not and cannot be responsible for anything that may occur in any part of it. I again beg leave most respectfully to suggest that these are perilous, alarming and highly critical times even to the very existence of the Government and that the administration must act with the utmost vigor without resort to expediency or compromise, most especially in its military functions. These suggestions spring from the sincerest interest for the welfare of the Country and the most respectful feeling for the Administration and the impression it seems to be gaining some strength upon those points are my apologies for the liberty I have taken.[28]

No reply by Monroe to this letter has been found but Winder's doubts as to the troops to be assigned him were dispelled when on the following day, the brigades of General Douglas and General Singleton, comprising militia from Virginia, were put under his command, together with the 36th and 38th regiments of regu-

[27] Monroe to Smith, September 2. Smith MSS.
[28] Winder MSS.

lars and Laval's cavalry which had been in the engagement at Bladensburg. "General Winder," the order continued, "is charged with the defense on the Ferry Branch. He will on application to the commanding officer of the Navy, be supplied with cannon and ammunition for the redoubts and officers and men to man it.[29]

On the face of it this was an important command, including in its area Forts McHenry, Babcock (also known as the Six Gun Battery) and Covington, occasionally mentioned as Fort Wadsworth—the main defense against an attack on the city from the upper reaches of the Patapsco River—but it offered no prospect of infantry operations and Winder appears to have sensed an intention to remove him to the rear.

An overland attack by the enemy from Washington by way of Ferry Bar was no longer apprehended. He had retired to his shipping in the lower Patuxent and if the city were attacked every prospect favored a joint military and naval operation.

The city's location on the north bank of the Patapsco 12 miles from its mouth, rendered it reasonably certain because of the River's narrow and comparatively shallow channel, that an attack would be directed along the peninsula which extends eastwardly from the city's limits to the Chesapeake Bay, bounded on the north by a body of water known as Back River as it is on the south by the Patapsco.

To meet this threat advantage was taken of a range of hills arising from the north shore of the inner harbor about in line with Fort McHenry extending northerly and approximately parallel with the city's eastern limits.

On these elevations, grouped under the name of Hampstead Hill, was constructed a series of earth works, circumvallations and bastions.[30] As it was in this area that an attack by the British

[29] Winder MSS. The commanding officer of the Navy at Baltimore was Commander John Rodgers.

[30] The location of the works prepared for the defense of Baltimore by its citizens are shown in the so-called "Winder's Map," a handsome copy of which is in the Maryland Historical Society. Those on the eastern limits of the city began at the Sugar House on the Harbor and extended to a location now marked by the intersection of Baltimore Street and Broadway; but Frederick M. Colston says: "There was a detached work west of Broadway and another one on McKim's Hill on the east side of the York Road (now Greenmount Avenue) and just south of the present [Greenmount] Cemetery; and a further one about where Broadway now crosses Gay Street. "Battle of North Point," *Maryland Historical Magazine* II (1907), 113.

was expected, it was where Winder preferred to be and he promptly made known to General Smith his dissatisfaction with his assignment.

> After the candor which I have evinced toward you, [he wrote], I cannot for a moment suppose that in the assignment of my command and station, any other motive than a just regard for my rank and other circumstances influenced you—and yet I cannot but believe that in a review of the arrangements you have made, you will be satisfied that it is unjust as relates to my rank and situation and in derogation from the ordinary principles of military service.[31]

With a full sense of military obligation to a superior officer, Winder nevertheless evinced a resolution to comply with Smith's order by taking prompt steps to inform himself of the state and position of his command and to examine the force and positions that required artillery and to give information as to what forces of that arm would be needed.

He established headquarters on High Street, in that part of the city known as Old Town, and in the order announcing it, took occasion to say:

> While the most unremitting attention will be paid to the drill, discipline and police of the respective corps comprising the command, the commanding officers will particularly attend to holding the respective commands in a state of readiness for marching at a moments warning and in a most effective state for service.[32]

But Winder immediately ran into a practical difficulty.

Although Forts McHenry, Babcock and Covington were within the limits of his command, the garrisons in them were not enumerated among the troops placed under him. He again wrote Smith, saying "I presume it is necessary only to suggest this circumstance to have it rectified."[33]

He also took occasion to inquire whether any works were ordered or being carried on within the line of defenses under his command and whether any laboring force had been appropriated for such purpose. "If not," he wrote, "I must beg that engineers may be directed to report to me for the purpose of strengthening the defenses as far as practical within the lines committed to me."

[31] Winder to Smith, September 5. Winder MSS.
[32] Winder MSS.
[33] Winder to Smith, September 7. Winder MSS.

Receiving no reply to this communication, three days later he wrote Smith again, saying he had in the meantime visited the forts and out of ninety-three men at Covington, one-half were unfit for duty " from the unhealthiness of the situation "; that the command to which he had been assigned was one of considerable responsibility but destitute of the essential means of enabling him to respond to it.[34]

This letter followed by a visit to Smith's headquarters resulted in an order from the latter dated September 10th that all regulars of every description in Baltimore be placed under Winder's command.[35]

Now Forts Babcock and Covington were garrisoned by men in the naval service under the command of Commodore John Rodgers, a command which was separate from that of General Smith and not subject to his orders.[35a] As a result the only garrison affected by the order placing all regulars under Winder was that in Fort McHenry, and Major George Armistead, who there commanded, now found Winder and not Smith his commanding officer.

While Winder's assignment under Smith was thus being worked into a definite pattern he found his administrative duties as commander of the 10th Military District confused and the territorial limits of his authority undefined.

Smith commanded in Baltimore, Monroe commanded in the District of Columbia and on the banks of the Potomac below that city. Winder therefore, felt it imperative to have his responsibility and authority clarified and with this in view he wrote Monroe as follows:

Every moment evinces more and more the impracticability of the present arrangement of the command of the 10th Military District. Subject as I am to the command of General Smith here, all the force with me is subject to the same command while all the forces in or near the Potomac are subject to your command. This precludes the possibility of my disposing of a man. The little force at Annapolis is all which is not actually included within your command or that of General Smith's. The whole staff of the District is either here or is with you. The quartermaster's

[34] Winder MSS. [35] Winder MSS.

[35a] Rodgers had been ordered to proceed to Washington from New York with a detachment of officers and men to help in its defense, but when he reached Baltimore Washington had been captured. He remained there and was given an important assignment in its defense.

department especially must be absolutely at the disposal of the commanding general, and since it is impossible that this department can act at the same time under District and independent orders, it follows that I cannot call on it for anything. The commissary of purchase and his deputies are in the same situation as relates to the requisition for supplies but besides this difficulty as relates to these officers, [he continues] it is impossible to conceive that an officer under the command of another, as I am under General Smith, can have the power to issue orders inconsistent with his, or which are not his orders; and yet as commander of the District, according to the idea of the President and yourself, it is supposed I may do so. Besides, General Smith's power, according to the Constitution, is limited to his division and the troops united with them and has no local extent beyond."

He then asks how the expired enlistments are to be dealt with. "Not by Smith," he submits, "since his powers are limited to his Division." Not by himself since his officers to whom orders would be issued, are either under Monroe's command or that of Smith. Men are ready, he points out, to come in from Pennsylvania and although contrary to military order and subordination,

I shall direct them under the present state of affairs, to come to this City. When they arrive they fall under the command of General Smith, or not, as he may deem it proper to order payment of expenses incurred in the march of detachment here. In truth Sir, it is unnecessary to multiply instances since it is impossible to move a step without violating all military rule and practice or making an impossible impasse. The present state of the Country requires that the command should be arranged without delay. No commanding officer can, in the present state of things, be responsible for any result which may happen." [36]

This letter, marked private, brought a frank and conciliatory reply from Monroe in which he explained the difficulties presented in the conflict in the command at Baltimore and the reasons for committing the command to Smith. It is a sort of letter that one friend might expect to receive from another.

"Your letter of yesterday," wrote Monroe, "states the existing derangements in the military command of this District and its injurious tendency and the sentiments you express on the whole subject are just and honorable to you." Reviewing the circumstances under which he became Secretary of War and took over military command of the District of Columbia, of which the reader has been informed, he continues:

[36] Winder to Monroe, September 7. Winder MSS.

On your return I offered to give up the military command in your favor, as I had done before your arrival to the President. He thought, and you concurred with him, that I had better continue to exercise the command for a while, having in your absence adopted certain measures which were in a train of execution. General Smith having been called into service by the Governor of Maryland with the rank of Major General, would not yield to that which had been conferred on you by the President as commander of the District. The question had been submitted by you to the Government and was not decided by General Armstrong; in the meantime General Smith retained the command at Baltimore, against which it was still apprehended that the enemy would move with their whole force by water up the bay. In this state of things, it was thought improper to make any change in the command at Baltimore, lest it might cause some derangement there injurious to the public interest. The command at the White house where Porter was appointed to erect and command a battery, and in support of which two brigades of militia were ordered was offered to you. You preferred returning to Baltimore, in the expectation that it would be attacked, and in the belief that you might render more important services there.

Possessing fully the confidence of the Government, it was wished to place you where you might render most service.

Whether it is proper to maintain the principle, that a Brigadier General, appointed to command a military district, shall take rank of all others in that district, though of a superior rank in the line, of the regular army or militia, is doubtful.— You will admit that there was an evident difficulty, and that some injury might have resulted from it, in the present call, under all the circumstances attending it.

The evils however resulting from the displacement of the commander of a district, who ought to be of the regular army, by the call of a large body of militia into the field, on a sudden emergency, and of a militia General to command them of higher grade than that of the commander of the district are obvious.— The command ought to be committed to a General of the regular army, that he may remain constantly in the discharge of its duties, which will exist while the war lasts.— The duties of the military commander of a District are extensive and various. The selection of proper points for defense, and the erection of works on them, the call for supplies of every kind, the call on the States for militia and the distribution of the force generally, are duties which require the direction and control of a person who may be long in office, and be thereby enabled to reduce the whole into a system. The sudden displacement of such a commander by a General of the Militia, utterly unacquainted with the whole business, equally in the outline and detail, cannot fail to cause derangement and serious injury. The difficulty in the present case is, to make any change at this time especially at Baltimore.

To your resuming the command here and in every other part of the district, there is now no obstacle. My command was intended to be temporary and has ceased; you know from the part which I acted before,

under you, that I could have had but one motive in undertaking it. Should the enemy cease to menace Baltimore, the difficulty to the resumption of your command there, may soon be removed. Such a state of things might replace you, while it lasted in the command of the whole district, but a new incursion of the enemy in force, might and probably would produce the same difficulty.

There appears to be no effectual remedy to this evil, free from objection, but that of placing in the command of the Districts, officers who would take rank of Major Generals of the militia; the evil being applicable to all the districts, the remedy should be co-extensive over them. At this time it cannot be taken up on that scale, if indeed the intervention of Congress will not be necessary for that purpose.

Should the enemy descend the bay, and relieve this quarter from apprehension, the command may undergo some change. Should you be willing to resume the command here and elsewhere with the exception of Baltimore, it is desirable that you repair here, unless you should find some serious objection to it.

I repeat that the President entertains a high respect for your talents and merit, and that he is disposed to evince it, on every suitable occasion.[37]

However gratified General Winder may have been at the tenor of this letter, he felt that Monroe had not considered and answered the main point of his contention. In a rejoinder written on September 9th, also marked "private," he fears he did not state it "with requisite precision."

My object, he wrote, was purely to state the real and possibly fatal embarrassments to which the Service might be reduced from the undefined nature and limits of Command existing in the District and from a belief that some order from the War Department might fix with more precision the Command respectively to be performed by the Major General of Militia and my duties as Commander of the District.[38]

He concluded this letter by directing attention to Annapolis which he still considers within the limits of his command and to the necessity of doing something for its defense.

On the day before North Point was fought Monroe answered this letter, and made it clear that Winder need give himself no concern about Annapolis.

There can be but one Commander, [he wrote], in every quarter for which any particular force is intended. The force at Baltimore being relied on for the protection of that place, Annapolis and all other places in this District on the Bay, being under General Smith, the movement

[37] Monroe to Winder, September 8. Winder MSS.
[38] Winder MSS.

of troops must be under his control. I thought this idea was conveyed in my last. Finding that you do not so understand it, I hasten to correct the mistake and to express my full confidence that you will do everything in your power to promote the success of our arms in defense of our Country.[39]

Enclosed in this letter was a copy of one to General Smith dated September 10th requesting him to look to and provide defense for both Baltimore and Annapolis and any other places in that quarter which may be in danger. "General Winder," he wrote, "who as Commander of the District has made calls for the militia from different quarters, is instructed to cooperate and give you all the aid in his power."

This letter and that to Smith left Winder in no doubt that his command of the 10th District was now titular only. However, any resentment he may have felt appears to have been completely neutralized by his zeal for action in the attack on Baltimore which the British were preparing to deliver. This ambition he had confided to Monroe in the following words: "I am anxious only to acquit myself to the utmost in the present occasion in whatever situation I can, without recognizing the justice of the hasty prejudiced judgments, which may have formed of the late events."[40]

"The late events," of course, mean Bladensburg. He hoped for an opportunity to confuse those who had questioned his military competency by a display of the qualities that had won him recognition on the Niagara frontier.

But he was to be disappointed. In the afternoon of September 11th when the American forces marched from Baltimore to oppose the British in any advance upon the city from the east, they were not under the command of General Winder who, as second in rank to General Smith, was by the rules of seniority clearly entitled to this honor. Smith had given the command to his old companion in arms, John Stricker, an officer with the militia rank of brigadier general, and who, as we have seen, headed the committee that waited on Smith requesting him to take command at Baltimore. Stricker, now in his fifty-sixth year, had a creditable record of service in the Continental Army out of which he came in the grade of captain.

[39] Monroe to Winder, September 11. Winder MSS.
[40] Winder to Monroe, September 9. Winder MSS.

Notwithstanding the defeat of his force by the British at North Point on September 12th, Stricker succeeded in withdrawing his troops without serious loss, and took a position at Worthington Mills beyond the northern limits of Baltimore and east of the Belair Road. Here General Winder with his troops was ordered to join him. When the enemy began his withdrawal on the early morning of the 14th an attempt was made to harass him, but General Smith reported that " all the troops were so worn out with continuous attacking and with being under arms during three days and nights, exposed the greater part of the time to very inclement weather, that it was found impracticable to do anything more than pick up a few stragglers."

Whatever disappointment Winder may have felt in being denied the command of the troops led by Stricker against the British must have been tempered by the results at North Point, where some of the militia proved no more steady than had those at Bladensburg, and by the fact that his services were especially commended by Smith in his General Orders.[42] The abandonment of the attack upon Baltimore by the land and naval forces, carefully planned by the British, brought relief from an anxiety so grave to those burdened with its defense, that no room was left in which jealousies and resentments could blossom. The city had been saved from seizure by the British and there was glory enough for all to have a share.

In none of the reports made by the officers engaged in defending the city is this better displayed than in a Division Order issued by General Winder from his headquarters on New Church Street and signed by Robert G. Hite, Assistant Adjutant General, a member of his staff, in which he praises Major Armistead and the officers and men in Fort McHenry as follows:

> The garrison of Fort McHenry, under the command of major Armistead, are entitled to, and receive the warmest acknowledgments and praise from the brigadier-general, for their steady, firm, and intrepid deportment during an almost incessant bombardment for twenty-four hours, during which time they were exposed to an incessant shower of shells.
>
> The militia artillery of the third brigade, under captains Nicholson and Berry, and lieutenant Pennington, vied with the regulars in a firmness and

[41] T. H. Palmer, ed., *Historical Register*, IV, 189.

[42] " To Brigadier-general Winder he [Smith] tenders his thanks for his aid, co-operation and prompt pursuit of the enemy." *Ibid.*, p. 204.

composure which would have honoured veterans, and prove that they were worthy to cooperate with the regular artillery, infantry, and sea-fencibles, in defense of that important post. Major Armistead receives also the warmest acknowledgments of the general commanding, for his able, vigilant, and exact arrangements before and during this period of arduous duty, as well as for the uniform zeal, vigour, and ability he has discovered in his preparations for the defense of the post immediately committed to his charge, as for the prompt and efficacious manner in which he has complied, under great and perplexing difficulties, with demands from all quarters for ammunition.

Lieutenant-colonel Stewart and Major Lane, neither of whom were required to expose themselves in this dangerous post, will please accept the brigadier-general's warmest acknowledgements for the handsome and gallant manner in which they volunteered to take command of the regular infantry; who, with their officers and men, have evinced the most resolute and steady intrepidity in the midst of imminent and long-continued danger.[43]

The menace of renewed attack on Baltimore was relieved by the withdrawal of the British fleet and transports to the lower Chesapeake, whence they shortly passed out to sea, with the exception of a force too small to give concern.

On September 21st Winder was ordered to Washington along with the U. S. troops under his command and the Virginia militia comprising General Douglas' brigade. This move was explained to him in a letter from Monroe written the same day and marked " private and confidential." In this letter Monroe said that an investigation of the events connected with the capture of Washington would probably " be set on foot " and inasmuch as Winder was involved he thought it well for him to be in Washington where he could communicate with his friends and then again to take duty on the Niagara frontier.

Moreover, he said, Major General Winfield Scott had been sent home from the Niagara frontier because of wounds which

[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 201-2. That General Winder should have resorted to the expediency of this order indicates that his reluctance to subordinate his command to that of Smith had not been entirely overcome. An exact adherence to military precept would appear to have required a report to his superior officer such as Stricker made to Smith. It also may be noted that Armistead instead of making his report to Winder made one directly to Monroe, Secretary of War. It would be interesting to know if Armistead's apparently unfriendly attitude toward Winder was responsible for what Major General James Wilkinson claimed to be the refusal of the Madison administration to give him the recognition that his services as commanding officer at Fort McHenry called for. It is a fact that he got nothing better than a lieutenant colonelcy by brevet in which rank he died in 1818. See Wilkinson's *Memoirs* (1816), II, 795.

had rendered him incapable of service there, and that he would be ordered to take command of the 10th Military District and thereby relieve the situation created by the combined service of himself and General Smith.[44]

To this Winder replied that in the circumstances he must avoid any appearance of running away and that a command on the Niagara frontier must come to him not as an offer but as an order. On September 22nd the order was issued and upon its receipt Winder before leaving Washington once more wrote Monroe.

> I reply [he said], with confidence that this sudden removal to so great a distance from the scene of my late command at a moment likely to produce an investigation into what has passed, will not be permitted to operate disadvantageously to me, and the more especially as it is more than probable the occasion for distinguishing myself where I am going, will be past before my arrival.[45]

In this manner were brought to a close the perplexities, annoyances and disappointments that beset Winder's command of the 10th Military District. It also closed his conflict with General Smith and here we take leave of him.

In so doing it may be said his surmise as to lack of opportunity for distinguishing himself proved to be sound. Shortly after his arrival on the frontier, the troops went into winter quarters and when spring opened, the Treaty of Ghent had been ratified and the War ended.

The assumption of command in this area by Major General Scott likewise terminated that of General Smith, who nevertheless stoutly maintained to the last his conception of the rightful rank of an officer in the militia service vis-à-vis that of an officer of the regular army. In a letter to Governor Winder he said:

> General Scott being a Major General by Brevet only in the service of the United States, cannot under my impression of military etiquette, command a commissioned Major General of Militia. This circumstance would at any other period have compelled me to insist on such a construction of the relation or rank of United States and Militia officers, but as the course of conduct might be the cause of great inconvenience and injury to the public good at the present moment, and [being] anxious of preventing such an unpleasant state of things, I have determined to retire from the Militia service.[46]

[44] Winder MSS.
[45] Winder to Monroe, September 22. Winder MSS.
[46] Smith to Governor Winder, Oct. 18. Smith MSS.

As we now take leave of General Smith, a word or two about him may be added. The City of Baltimore recognized the services of Commodore John Rodgers in its defense by presenting him with a handsome silver service and those rendered by Major Armistead by having his portrait painted by Rembrandt Peale and by presenting him with a massive silver punch bowl, a large tray, a ladle and twelve mugs. To Captain John A. Webster for his services two swords were presented, one by the City and one by the State. Apart from the City Council's order for a portrait of him, the services rendered by General Smith as Commander-in-Chief went unrecognized by the City, the State and the Federal Government.[47]

Nor did he escape calumniating accusations. Not only was he criticized for not taking the offensive on Tuesday following the Battle of North Point and attacking Brooks' troops, but he was charged with having sent word to Armistead to surrender Fort McHenry and Cochrane.[48] One hundred years elapsed before the citizens of Baltimore, under the leadership of a progressive mayor, erected his statue and carved on its pedestal the record of his services as Soldier, Statesman and Patriot.[49]

[47] Part of the silver service presented to Rodgers may be seen at the Maryland Historical Society, to which it has been loaned by descendants. There also may be seen the swords presented to Webster. A cut of the pieces presented to Armistead is shown in Lossing's *Pictorial Field-Book of the War of 1812* (New York, 1868), p. 960. They are now in the National Museum, Washington, to which they were presented in 1921 by Armistead's great-grandson, Alexander Gordon, Jr., Esq. The portrait by R. Peale hangs in the Baltimore Municipal Museum.

[48] In a letter to Samuel Smith, his father, Oct. 22, 1814, John Spear Smith states that Gen. Winfield Scott is among those who think Gen. Smith exercised correct judgment in not taking the offensive. As to the surrender of Fort McHenry, see a letter from Smith to Armistead, Nov. 6, 1815, and one from Armistead to Smith, Dec. 7, 1815. All these letters are in the Smith MSS.

[49] This statue on the edge of Wyman Park facing Charles Street is unhappily dwarfed by the spacious setting.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE IN BALTIMORE, 1814-1815

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF VIGILANCE AND SAFETY

Edited by WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

Civilian defense is not a recent development in Baltimore. There was a Committee of Safety in Revolutionary times, and the minutes of the Committee of Vigilance and Safety during the War of 1812 indicate a striking resemblance between the activities of that period and those of current date. There were no air-raid wardens, no blood donors, and no USO helpers, but other phases of the work were carried on thoroughly and efficiently.

The membership of the Committee, consisting of three representatives from each of the eight wards and from the adjoining Eastern and Western Precincts, remained at thirty. There was only one change in personnel, occasioned by Elias Ellicott's resignation because of his Quaker views on war and William Jessop's substitution in his place. Of the thirty-one names on the roll, at least sixteen were merchants, and there was a judge, a cabinetmaker, a brickmaker, a butcher, a boatbuilder, and a sea captain. Probably the most distinguished member was Col. John Eager Howard, hero of the Revolution and a former Governor and former United States Senator. Close behind him was Theodorick Bland, soon to acquire the position of Chancellor. Cumberland Dugan, Solomon Etting, Samuel Hollingsworth, William Lorman, William Patterson, and William Wilson—all merchants—were among the leading citizens of Baltimore business and social circles. It is interesting to note that, with a few exceptions, the work of the Committee was performed by the less prominent members.

The Committee met daily for most of the period of its existence. Sometimes there were only routine matters to be considered and

the gatherings could not have lasted more than ten or fifteen minutes. On other occasions, there was considerable business to be transacted, and the sessions were prolonged. When the British approached the City, the Committee met twice a day on September 11th and 13th, 1814; and on September 12th and 14th the members assembled in morning, afternoon, and evening to discuss defense measures.

The similarity between the activities of 1814-15 and those of 1944 is emphasized by a review of the varied phases of the work performed by the Committee of Vigilance and Safety. One of the first steps—strictly in accord with the "vigilance" portion of the title—was the appointment of a subcommittee to investigate cases of persons who expressed sentiments inimical to the American cause or to the defense of Baltimore. Several such persons were cited, arrested, examined, and either placed in confinement or removed from the City. At one point, the Committee issued a warning to citizens to watch their tongues, saying that idle talk and defeatist opinions might hinder the measures to be taken for the protection of the people. Deserters from the enemy were to be confined and examined by another subcommittee, then sent out of town. The watch on the streets was doubled, and, after September 11th, soldiers were ordered to patrol at night.

The biggest problem of defense was the erection of earthworks on the hills to the east and southeast of the City. For this purpose, the entire community was divided into four districts, each of which was to work on the fortifications at specified times in rotation. Superintendents, representing principally the construction trades, were appointed to supervise the actual labor. Men exempt from military service and free people of color were included in the work parties, masters were expected to send their slaves, and other patriotic citizens and visitors from out of town were invited to take part. Tools—wheel barrows, pick axes, spades, and shovels—were ordered to central depositories, and lumber for braces and bomb-proof shelters were requisitioned. On September 5th, the work system was changed somewhat, with one superintendent for each spot to be fortified. The only men who functioned as a unit in the construction of fortifications were thirty carpenters in the employ of Robert Cary Long.

Weapons and provisions were important items on the agenda of the Committee. Guns were ordered to be repaired and fitted

up, and when there was a suggestion of removing some artillery pieces from the City, vigorous and successful protest was raised. A subcommittee was appointed to procure thirty or more scows to be sunk in the channel leading to the wharves, and, later, vessels loaded with light wood were prepared for use as fire ships. Tents and other articles of camp equipage were gathered together, arrangements were made with a baker to supply bread to the soldiers on duty, and, when the time of actual combat arrived, all the food for the fighters was prepared in town and carted out to the lines. The Committee also had in mind the morale of the troops and appropriated six hundred dollars to be spent on music for the regiments of General Stricker's brigade.

Health and housing were two problems common to 1814 and 1944. A subcommittee was directed to inquire into the possibilities for the care of the wounded; it was determined that the public hospital could accommodate 1000 men, and a staff of surgeons under Dr. Colin McKenzie was appointed. The encampments of the troops were watched and nuisances ordered to be removed. Housing for out-of-towners connected with the defense preparations was arranged, and citizens who were forced to remove from the neighborhoods of the fortifications were located in other parts of the City. A Committee of Relief, composed of prominent members of the Society of Friends and representatives of various classes of people, was appointed to raise money and gather necessaries for the poor and the destitute.

When the enemy actually appeared in sight, a sort of martial law was established. A curfew on the sale of spirituous liquors was set, and taverns other than those for travellers were ordered to close at nine o'clock. After the repulse of the British at North Point, carriages and hacks were impressed to bring the wounded from the field of battle, and members of the Committee attended to the decent and honorable burial of the "brave fellow citizens" who had fallen.

The minutes of the Committee of Vigilance and Safety, extending from its organization on August 24, 1814, through January 9, 1815, were kept by James Wilson, member from the 4th Ward. The original manuscript, 160 pages long, was given by him to his grandson, James G. Wilson (1831-1904), in 1859, and was presented to the Maryland Historical Society in 1906 by William Bowly Wilson (1839-1915). The minutes from the beginning

through August 31st have been printed in W. M. Marine, *The British Invasion of Maryland, 1812-1815* (Baltimore, 1913), pp. 133-145, but do not appear to have been published in their entirety.

Baltimore 24th August 1814

In conformity to the recomme[n]dation and resolves of a meeting of a number of citizens convened by the Mayor at the Council Chamber on the 23d instant—Meeings were held in the different wards at 10 o'clock yesterday morning, when the following persons were duly elected, in each ward, to form a general Committee of Vigilance and Safety during the present times of alarm—to wit—

1st Ward

Henry Stouffer [1]
Solomon Etting [2]
Elias Ellicott * [3]

Elias Ellicott Chairman and Solomon Etting Sect. of the meeting

* Wm. Jessop [4] in E. E.'s place

2d Ward

Samuel Hollingsworth [5]
Benjamin Berry [6]
Henry Payson [7]

Henry Payson, chairman
A. I. Schwartz [8]—Sect.

3d Ward

William Lorman [9]
James A. Buchanan [0]
William Wilson [11]

James Calhoun,[12] Chairman
John Hollins,[13], Sect.

4th Ward

William Patterson [14]
Adam Fonerden [15]
James Wilson [16]

Jacob Myers,[17] Chairman
Joshua Jones,[18] Sect.

[1] Henry Stouffer (d. 1835).
[2] Solomon Etting (1764-1847), merchant, 278 Baltimore St.
[3] Elias Ellicott (d. 1826), flour merchant, Ellicott's Wharf, dwelling 30 Sharp St.
[4] William Jessop (d. 1829), merchant, 95 Bowly's Wharf, dw. 13 Fayette St.
[5] Samuel Hollingsworth (1757-1830), merchant, dw. 9 N. Charles St.
[6] Benjamin Berry, brickmaker, cor. Lee and Sharp Sts.
[7] Henry Payson (1762-1845), merchant, 15 Bowly's Wharf, dw. Hanover St.
[8] A. I. Schwartz, merchant, 71½ Bowly's Wharf.
[9] William Lorman (1764-1841), merchant, dw. New Church [Lexington] cor. N. Charles St.
[10] James A. Buchanan (d. 1840), merchant, Washington Sq. [Monument Sq.]
[11] William Wilson (1750-1824), shipping merchant, 105 Baltimore St.
[12] James Calhoun (1743-1816), 1st Mayor of Baltimore (1797).
[13] John Hollins (d. 1827), merchant, dw. Washington Sq.
[14] William Patterson (1752-1835), merchant, 18 South St.
[15] Adam Fonerden (1750-1817), merchant (dry goods), 54 Baltimore St.
[16] James Wilson (1775-1851), merchant, dw. Holliday St.
[17] Jacob Myers (d. 1822), merchant, 55 Baltimore St., dw. Holliday St.
[18] Joshua Jones, woollen draper, 56 Baltimore St.

5th Ward	
Joseph Jamison [19] Cumberland Dugan [20] William Camp [21]	Cumberland Dugan, Chairman George Franciscus,[22] Sect.
6th Ward	
James Armstrong [23] James Taylor [24] Peter Bond [25]	James Taylor, chairman James Wilson,[26] Sect.
7th Ward	
Robert Stewart [27] Frederick Schaffer [28] Richard Stevens [29]	Robert Stewart, chairman William B. Barney,[30] Sect.
8th Ward	
Hezekiah Waters [31] David Burke [32] George Woelpert [33]	Hezekiah Waters, chairman John Snyder,[34] Sect.
Eastern Precincts	
Hermanus Alricks [35] John Kelso [36] Richard Frisby [37]	Hermanus Alricks, Chairman Richard Frisby, Sect.
Western Precincts	
Col. John E. Howard [38] George Warner [39] Theodorick Bland [40]	Emmanuel Kent,[41] Chairman Theodorick Bland, Sect.

[19] Joseph Jamison, 42 N. Frederick St.
[20] Cumberland Dugan (1759-1836), merchant, S. Gay St.
[21] William Camp (1774-1822), cabinetmaker, 26 Water St.
[22] George Franciscus, jeweller and silversmith, 30 Baltimore St.
[23] James Armstrong (d. 1823), merchant, 94 High St.
[24] James Taylor, 14 High St.
[25] Peter Bond (d. 1821), merchant, 9 Bridge [Gay] St.
[26] James Wilson, justice of the peace, 23 Bridge St.
[27] Robert Stewart (d. 1840?), Duke [Granby] St.
[28] Frederick Schaffer—not in directory.
[29] Richard Stevens (d. 1829), sea captain, 107 Bond St.
[30] William B. Barney (1780-1838), Queen St. Son of Com. Joshua Barney.
[31] Hezekiah Waters, merchant, 33 Pitt [Fayette] St.
[32] David Burke, boat builder, 4 George St.
[33] George Woelpert, butcher, 40 George St.
[34] John Snyder (1757-1827), ship chandler, 41 Fells [Thames] St.
[35] Hermanus Alricks (1764-1840).
[36] John Kelso (1767-1850).
[37] Richard Frisby (d. 1845).
[38] John Eager Howard (1752-1827), "Belvidere" estate.
[39] George Warner (1769-1829).
[40] Theodorick Bland (1776-1846), judge of 6th district.
[41] Emanuel Kent, merchant, Paca St. nr. Franklin—had son Emanuel who was a private in Capt. Pennington's Company and lost an arm at North Point.

Baltimore 24th August 1814

At a meeting of the committee of Vigilance & Safety elected from the several wards and each of the Precincts of the city of Baltimore held at the Council Chamber at 5 o'clock P. M. this day in pursuance of Public Notice—When Edward Johnson,[42] Esqr, the Mayor, being called to the Chair, and Theodorick Bland Esqr appointed Secretary—The Mayor in a short address opened to the Committee the general nature and objects of the business proposed to be submitted to their consideration—

On motion Resolved, That Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Bland and Mr. Payson be a Committee to prepare an address to the citizens which shall be submitted to this Committee for their approbation at their next meeting—

Resolved, That this Committee meet every day at 10 o'clock A. M. in the Council Chamber—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 25th August 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—when the proceedings of yesterday were read—

The Committee charged with the drafting of an address to the citizens made a report which was ordered to lie on the table—

The following Resolutions were then moved & adopted

1, Resolved, That all good citizens be and they are hereby requested to give to this committee any information they may have relative to suspected persons or places—and that the members of this Committee be and they are hereby required to appoint such person or persons as they may think proper in each ward or precinct to search suspected persons and places—And the persons so appointed shall report to this Committee any information that may be obtained—

2—Resolved, That the owners of Vessels now moored and made fast at or near the wharves of the city are hereby directed to remove their Vessels immediately to some place below Harris' Creek for the greater security—

3—Resolved That all Deserters from the enemy shall during the present time of alarm be confined to the Goal and Goal yard, where their situation shall be made as comfortable as the nature of things will admit; that any extra expense for that purpose shall be provided for by this commitee, and that Mr. Frisby, Mr. Kelso and Mr. Bland be and they are hereby appointed to adjust with the Goaler the amount of such extra expense and to report to this committee—

4th Whereas it has been communicated to this Committee by Brig. Genl. Stricker,[43] Com. Perry,[44] Maj. Armstead [45] and Capt. Spence [46] in person

[42] Edward Johnson (1767-1829), physician, dw. King George [Lombard] St. "near Brown's brewery"—mayor 1808-16.
[43] John Stricker (1758-1825).
[44] Oliver Hazard Perry (1785-1819).
[45] George Armistead (1780-1818). In command at Fort McHenry.
[46] Robert Traill Spence (1785-1826).

that it is their wish that Mag. Genl. Smith be requested to take the Command of the Forces which may be called into service for the defence of the city, therefore—Resolved, That, Col. John E. Howard, Mr. Frisby and Mr. Stewart be appointed to wait on Maj. Genl. Smith and to communicate to him the information this Committee have received, to state that they unanimously concur with the same, and to request that he would at this important crisis take upon himself the command of the Forces that may be called out for the defence of our City—

5—Resolved, That the gentlemen named in the forgoing resolution wait on Maj. Genl. Smith and report his answer to this committee forthwith—

The gentlemen who were so appointed accordingly retired and after a short time reported that Maj. Genl. Smith was at this time willing and would take upon himself the command of the Forces that might be called out for the defence of the City, but that he wished to be sanctioned in so doing by the Executive of this State and that his powers might be extended; whereupon it was

6. Resolved That Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Bland & Mr. Frisby be and they are hereby appointed to address a letter to the Governor of this State requesting him to invest Maj. Genl. Smith with powers in every respect commensurate to the present exigency, which shall be forwarded immediately by express; and that they report to this committee at their next meeting—

The committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 26th August 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met according to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read and the first, second, & fourth Resolutions and the names of this Committee were ordered to be published—(Mr. Bland from the Committee reported that the Goaler had agreed to receive hold & maintain in a comfortable manner any Deserters that might be committed to him for the sum of twenty five cents per day—

On motion it was—Resolved, That four seamen who have presented themselves as deserters from the enemy be placed under the care of a Constable and at the expense of this Committee conveyed beyond the Susquehanna where there shall be given to each out of the funds of this Committee the sum of two dollars—

2—Resolved, That Mr. Daniel Conner [47] be and he is hereby requested to place himself in the service of this Committee for a compensation to be hereafter agreed upon; and that it be his duty, vigilantly to search for all suspected strangers or other persons, and in a discreet exercise of this authority, to report such persons to, or bring them before the mayor—

3. Resolved, That the Mayor be and is hereby authorised and directed to employ an additional watch, to guard the City and precincts, and that the expense be paid out of the funds of the Committee of Vigilance and

[47] Daniel Conner (d. 1822), merchant, 68 Albemarle St.

Safety; and that the city commissioners and the companies of the Eastern and Western Precincts, be requested to aid him in the execution thereof—

4—Whereas in the present exigency, money will be wanted for various purposes, therefore,

Resolved, That the inhabitants of the City and Precincts be and they are hereby invited to contribute thereto by calling at the Mayors Office, who will receive such contributions, and will publish the names of the contributors and the sums by them severally given, to be appropriated to such objects as the committee of vigilance & safety may authorise and direct—

Ordered that the third and fourth of the foregoing Resolutions be published—

Mr. Buchannan from the committee appointed to address a letter to the Governor reported that they had forwarded a letter by express a copy of which was read and approved—

A Letter from the Governor in answer to that which was address[ed] to him from this committee respecting Maj. Genl. Smith's command was received & read—

Baltimore 27th August 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

On motion the following resolutions were adopted to wit—

Whereas the Commanding officer has requested the aid of the citizens, in the erection of works for the defence of the city, and the Committee of Vigilance and Safety having full confidence in the patriotism of their fellow citizens, have agreed on the following organization for the purpose of complying with the request of the Major General—

The inhabitants of the city and precincts are called on to deposit at the Court House in the third ward, Centre Market in the fifth ward, Riding School, in the seventh ward, Market House Fells Point, and take with them to the place required all wheel barrows, pick axes, spades & shovels that they can procure—

That the city and precincts be divided into four sections the first section to consist of the Eastern precincts and the eighth ward, the second to comprize the 5th 6th and 7th wards, and the third to comprize the 2d. 3d. and 4th wards, and the fourth to comprize the 1st ward and the Western precincts—

That the exempts from militia duty and the free people of colour, of the first district, consisting of the 8th ward and the Eastern Precincts, assemble tomorrow, *Sunday morning*, at 6 o'clock, at Hampstead Hill, with provisions for the day, and that Arthur Mitchell,[48] Daniel Conn,[49] Henry Pennington,[50] John Chalmers,[51] William Starr,[52] Thomas Weary,

[48] Arthur Mitchell, cooper, 93 French [Front] St.
[49] Daniel Conn (d. 1836), carpenter, Aisquith St.
[50] Henry Pennington (d. 1825), inspector of lime, 74 Green St.
[51] John Chalmers (d. 1817).
[52] William Starr (d. 1819).

Henry Harwood, and Philip Cunmiller, be charged with the superintendance during the day—

That the second District, comprising the 5th, 6th, and 7th wards assemble at Myers Garden on *Monday* morning under the superintendance of William Parks,[53] Capt Watts,[54] Ludwick Herring,[55] William Ross,[56] William Carman,[57] Daniel Howland,[58] Caleb Ernest, and James Hutton [59]—

That those of the third district, comprising the 2d. 3d. and 4th wards assemble at Washington Square on *Tuesday morning,* under the superintendance of Frederick Leypold,[60] William McClary,[61] John McKim junr.[62] Henry Schroeder [63] Alexander McDonald,[64] Eli Hewitt,[65] Peter Gold [66] and Alexander Russell [67]—

That those of the fourth district comprising the 1st ward and the Western precincts, assemble at the intersection of Eutaw and Market Streets on *Wednesday* under the superintendance of William W. Taylor,[68] William Jessup, Edward Harris,[69] George Decker,[70] William Hawkins,[71] Isaac Philips,[72] William Jones and John Hignet [73]—

The owners of slaves are requested to send them to work on the days assigned in the several districts—

Such of our patriotic fellow citizens of the country or elsewhere, as are disposed to aid in the common defence are invited to partake in the duties now required, on such days as may be most convenient to them—

Ordered, That the foregoing Resolution be published—

Ordered, That John Kelso, George Woelpert, Robert Stewart, Peter Bond, William Camp, Adam Fonerden, William Lorman, Benjamin Berry, Henry Stouffer, and George Warner members of this Committee be and they are hereby requested to give notice to the persons appointed to carry into effect the foregoing Resolution in the several districts and to aid them with their advice and assistance—

[53] William Parks (d. 1823).
[54] Joseph Watts, sea captain, Wolf nr. Milk St.
[55] Ludwig Herring (d. 1817), lumber merchant, 17 McElderry's Wharf, dw. 78 Albemarle St.
[56] William Ross (1760-1820), merchant, 7 Baltimore St. (cor. Market Space).
[57] William Carman, slate manufacturer, High St.
[58] Daniel Howland, merchant, dw. 22 N. Frederick St.
[59] James Hutton (d. 1838), grocer, 24 Baltimore St.
[60] Frederick Leypold (1771-1821), grocer, 61 N. Gay St.
[61] William McCleary, bootmaker, 35 South St.
[62] John McKim, Jr. (1767-1842), merchant, 108 Baltimore St.
[63] Henry Schroeder (1764-1839), merchant, 167 Baltimore St., dw. 54 N. Charles St.
[64] Alexander McDonald (1752-1832), grocer, cor. Ann and Alisanna Sts.
[65] Eli Hewitt, tobacconist, 232 Baltimore St.
[66] Peter Gold (1793-1847), sea captain, 17 S. Charles St.
[67] Alexander Russell, brickmaker, Lee nr. Goodman St.
[68] William W. Taylor (d. 1832), merchant, 266 Baltimore St., dw. Eutaw St.
[69] Edward Harris (d. 1837), physician, 280 Baltimore St.
[70] George Decker (1764-1846), merchant, 24 N. Howard St.
[71] William Hawkins (1754-1818).
[72] Isaac Phillips, merchant, cor. Paca and Fayette Sts., dw. N. Howard St.
[73] John Hignat (d. 1822), brickmaker, Washington St.

Ordered, That Adam Fonerden, James Wilson and James Armstrong be and they are hereby appointed as a standing Committee of Accounts—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 28th August 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

The committee were informed by a letter from Elias Ellicott that, as his religious principles, (to wit, those of a quaker) would not permit him to interfere in military affairs, he therefore resigned his station as a member of this committee—

On motion Resolved, That this committee will fill up all vacancies occasioned in its own body by resignation or otherwise—

Resolved, That Mr. William Jessup be and he is hereby appointed a member of this committee to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Elias Ellicott—

Resolved, That, Mr. Etting, Mr. Taylor and Capt. Stevens be and they are hereby appointed to provide a Hospital or suitable accommodation for the sick and wounded of the Forces that are or may be called out for the defence of the City and to report to this committee at their next meeting—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 29th August 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

On motion Resolved, That Samuel Hollingsworth, Adam Fonerden, Cumberland Dugan, and Joseph Jamison or any three of them with the Mayor be and they are hereby appointed to examine all deserters from the enemy that may be apprehended and brought before them and to report to this committee—

The members appointed to provide quarters for the sick and wounded made report that they had obtained the use of the public Hospital [74] from Doctors McKenzie & Smythe in which there were accommodations for about one thousand—and that the compensation for the same was to be such as this committee should here after deem reasonable—

Mr. Jessup who was appointed to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Mr. Ellicott appeared and took his seat as a member—

Resolved, That it be and is hereby most earnestly recommended to the good people of the State of Maryland to be extremely circumspect in their communications respecting the movements of the Enemy and our preparations and disposition to resist him—In a particular manner they are exhorted to abstain from the expression of any opinions calculated to inspire a belief that the people of Baltimore will be found wanting in

[74] The Maryland Hospital, begun on the present site of the Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1798, was constructed with the aid of funds appropriated by the State Legislature. In 1808 it was leased to Drs. McKenzie and Smyth for 15 years.

what is due to themselves—The Committee are urged to this measure by perceiving as they do, with indignation that, Letters, degrading to our character have appeared in some of the distant papers; the writers and publishers of such must be alike objects of contempt to all who have any attachment for their country—

Ordered, That the foregoing Resolution be published immediately—

Resolved, That Mr. Payson, Mr. Lorman, & Mr. Jas. Wilson be and they are hereby appointed to wait on Maj. Genl. Smith and inform him that from the zeal manifested by our fellow citizens in the erection of works of defence as directed, they feel great pleasure in assuring him that, if he should deem it necessary to order the extension of those or the erection of other works, that they will be promptly undertaken—and that they be further instructed to inform the Major General that in whatever way the services of the Committee of Vigilance and Safety can be useful in providing for the comforts of their patriotic fellow Citizens in Arms, they will cheerfully undertake the same—and that they report to this Committee at their next meeting—

Baltimore 30th August 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

On motion Resolved, That the Resolution passed by this Committee on the 25th of this month relative to deserters from the Enemy be and the same is hereby repealed—

Resolved, That George Warner, Solomon Etting, William Jessup, David Burke and George Woelper be and they are hereby appointed a committee to wait on the Quarter Master General and tender to him their aid and that of this Committee in providing suitable accommodations for our fellow citizens in arms, who are assembling for the common defence—

Resolved, That, it be the particular and permanent duty of the above named committee, diligently to inquire into the wants of the Troops on their arrival and that they make known the same from time to time to this Committee and to those authorities in the staff department who are competent to supplying the same—

Whereas the Committee of Vigilance and Safety have received information from a respectable source that certain individuals are in the constant habit of making use of very improper and intemperate expressions, calculated to produce discussion, and to defeat the preparations making for the defence of our City—therefore—

Resolved, That Richard Frisby, William Camp and Peter Bond be and they are hereby appointed to investigate cases of this kind and make an immediate report to this board—

On motion the following address and appeal to our fellow citizens of the Country was adopted—to wit—

The ardour with which our fellow citizens in arms of this and the neighbouring states are hastening to the defence of our City affords the strongest evidence of the patriotism of our yeomanry and inspires this

committee with an earnest desire to make their situation here perfectly comfortable—The Committee reposes unlimited confidence in the disposition of the good people in this and the neighbouring states who are not employed in a military capacity to aid in this laudable purpose and they therefore confidently call upon them individually and collectively to bring to the city *for sale* such supplies as may contribute to the comfort of those to whom, under Providence, the safety of this City is confined—The Committee are authorised by the Major General to assure those who visit our City with the laudable intention of contributing to the comforts of its brave defenders that they shall be permitted to transact their business free from the danger of impressment to their waggons carts or Horses or of any species of interruption to themselves, and that if there be any cause of complaint the same shall be promptly removed on application to this committee—

Editors of news papers are requested to give this publicity—

Ordered That the foregoing address be published immediately, printed in handbills and disseminated as widely as possible—

Whereas the commanding officer has requested the *further* aid of the citizens in completing the works already so far advanced; and in erecting others for the defence of the city; and the Committee of Vigilance and Safety having full confidence in the patriotism of their fellow citizens—therefore—

Resolved, That the city and precincts, be divided into four districts, and that the exempts from militia duty and the free people of color, of the first district consisting of the 8th ward and Eastern precincts, be and they are hereby requested to assemble on Thursday next, and that Arthur Mitchell, Daniel Conn, Henry Pennington, John Chalmers, William Starr, Thomas Weary, Henry Harwood, Philip Cunmiller, John Price,[75] Bazil Smith,[76] John Gracy,[77] John Schunck, John Smith,[78] and Calvin Cooper,[79] be charged with the superintendance during the day —

That those of the second district, comprising the 5th, 6th and 7th wards, assemble on Friday next, under the superinendance of William Parks, Capt. Watts, Ludwick Herring, William Ross, William Carman, Caleb Arnest, Jacob Miller,[80] Robert Fisher,[81] John Gross,[82] James Hutton and George Auckerman —

That those of the third district comprising the 2d. 3d. and 4th wards assemble on Saturday next, under the superintendance of Frederick Leypold, William McClary, John McKim junr., Henry Schroeder, Alexander McDonald, Edi Hewitt, Peter Gold, and Alexander Russell—, and—

[75] John Price, ship carpenter, 17 Pitt St.
[76] Basil Smith, ship carpenter, Pitt St.
[77] John Gracey, carpenter, Aisquith St.
[78] John. Smith, cordwainer, Pitt St. ext. nr. Hampstead Hill.
[79] Calvin Cooper, grocer, 57 Bond St.
[80] Jacob Miller, tanner, Jones St.
[81] Robert Fisher (1762-1824), lumber merchant, Spear's Wharf, dw. 46 Jones St.
[82] John Gross (d. 1840), grocer, Bridge St.

That those of the fourth district, comprising the first ward and western precincts, assemble on Sunday next, under the superintendance of William W. Taylor, William Jessup, Edward Harris, George Decker, William Hawkins, Isaac Philips, William Jones, John Hignet, Charles Bohn,[83] Alexander Irvine,[84] Ferdinando Gourdon,[85] and Jonas Clopham[86]—

That John Kelso, George Woelpert, Robert Stewart, Peter Bond, William Camp, Adam Fonerden, William Lorman, Benjamin Berry, Henry Stouffer, and George Warner, members of this committee be and they are hereby requested to give notice, to the persons appointed as superintendants in their several districts, and to aid them with their advice and assistance

The owners of slaves are requested to send them to work, on the days assigned to the several districts; and such of our patriotic fellow citizens of the country, or elsewhere as are disposed to aid in the common defence, are invited to partake in the further duties now required on such days as may be most convenient—

The committee then adjourned

Baltimore 31st August 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Mr. Warner from the Committee appointed to wait on the Quarter Master General reported that they had done so and acquainted him with the readiness of this committee to cooperate in any way for the common good—

Mr. Hollingsworth from the committee appointed to examine Deserters from the Enemy reported, that, they had examined three, of whom they entertained no apprehensions but submitted to this committee for their consideration the propriety of sending such persons, at least some distance into the Country—

Resolved, That the chairman of this committee be and he is hereby authorised and requested to give to each of the abovementioned deserters five dollars from the funds of this committee, a passport, and order them to go out of the State of Maryland—

Ordered, That the Letter from the Major General to this Committee respecting a deposit in the Banks on loan be and the same is hereby referred to Mr. William Willson Mr. Waters and Mr. Payson with power and a request to communicate with the other Presidents and Directors of Banks and to report to this committee at its next meeting

This Committee were informed by their chairman that Mr. Robert C. Long[87] wth thirty carpenters in his imploy had tendered their services to this committee whenever called on and in whatever manner they might be required—

[83] Charles Bohn, merchant, 262 Baltimore St.
[84] Alexander Irvine (d. 1821), merchant, 21 N. Howard St.
[85] Ferdinand Gourdon (d. 1834), merchant, 3 Sharp St.
[86] Jonas Clapham (d. 1837)
[87] Robert Cary Long (1770-1833), carpenter, Conawago [Lexington] St.

Whereas the duties imposed on this committee, engrossing much of their attention, and it being necessary that immediate steps be taken to raise a *Committee of Relief* whose duty it shall be, to solicit subscriptions in money & necessaries for the relief of the poor and distressed, more particularly to be applied to the aid and support of families, whose distress is immediately occasioned, by the calling of the chief supporters of their families, on public service: therefore—

Resolved, That James Ellicott,[88] William W. Taylor, Elisha Tyson,[89] Richard H. Jones,[90] Levin Wethered,[91] Luke Tiernan,[92] William Riley,[93] James Mosher,[94] Joseph Townsend,[95] Peter Diffenderffer,[96] William Brown,[97] Daniel Diffenderffer,[98] William Trimble,[99] William Mundle,[100] William Proctor,[101] and John Ogsden,[102] be and they are hereby appointed a *Committee of Relief* requiring them in such manner as they shall think proper to adopt, to solicit subscriptions in money or other necessary supplies for the poor, and that they appoint a committee or committees, to ascertain by the best possible means, the situation and wants of the families of those called out on the present emergency, as well as all others who may probably need assistance, and that they distribute from time to time, with judicious care, such aid & comforts as they shall think proper—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 1st September 1814

The Committee of vigilance and safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Ordered, That the Letter from the Surgeons of the different Regiments attached to the command of Genl. Stansburys brigade be and the same is hereby referred to the committee appointed to aid the Quarter Master General, to act upon and report to this committee—

Whereas it is presumed that additional buildings for the accommodation of the Troops will be required and it having been signified to this committee by Maj. Genl. Smith as his wish that temporary Shed-Barracks in convenient situations be erected—therefore—

Resolved, That, Robert C. Long with the patriotic company of Carpenters in his imploy, who are exempt from military duty and who have

[88] James Ellicott (d. 1820).
[89] Elisha Tyson (1749-1824), 45 Sharp St.
[90] Richard H. Jones, currier, 8 Cheapside, dw. 76 Pratt St.
[91] Lewin Wethered (1778-1863), merchant, 155 Baltimore St., dw. Sharp St.
[92] Luke Tiernan (1757-1839).
[93] William Riley (d. 1825), bootmaker, East St.
[94] James Mosher (d. 1845), pres. Mechanic's Bank, New Church nr. Calvert St.
[95] Joseph Townsend (1756-1841).
[96] Peter Diffenderffer (d. 1842), hardware merchant, 28 Baltimore St.
[97] William Brown (d. 1828).
[98] Daniel Diffenderffer (d. 1819), 34 Great York [East Baltimore St.].
[99] William Trimble (d. 1819), Granby St.
[100] William Mundell, grocer, Fleet St. [Canton Ave.]
[101] William Proctor (d. 1860), merchant, 10 Fells St.
[102] John Ogston (1770-1834).

offered their services, or any others exempt from military duty, willing to be so employed, be immediately requested to erect the same under the superintendance of the committee appointed to aid the Quarter Master General in the discharge of his duties—and that Robert C. Long be furnished with a Copy of this Resolution and the names of the Committee—

The committee to whom was referred an enquiry into the conduct of Joseph Presbury [103] a Justice of the Peace of Fells Point, beg leave to report that, they have examined several respectable witnesses upon this subject and are perfectly satisfied from the testimony produced, that, the conduct of the said Presbury is highly censurable, and that he is frequently in the habit of expressing sentiments unworthy of an American citizen—That he has on a very recent occasion rejoiced at the difficulties and embarrassments into which he expected our Government would in all probability be thrown, and manifested pleasure at the powerful reinforcements which the Enemy were pouring into our Country—Your Committee further beg leave to represent that, the general character of the said Presbury appears to be marked with strongest impropriety, that, it has a tendency as far as his influence may extend, to damp the ardour of our patriotic citizens in defence of our City, and is highly derogatory to an officer holding a commission from the State of Maryland—Your Committee consider it as one of those cases which calls for the interposition of your Board, but leave it to your wisdom and judgment to mark out a proper course to be pursued—all which is respectfully submitted—Richard Frisby Chairman—

Ordered That, a Copy of the foregoing Report be transmitted to the Governor of this State and that he be respectfully requested to take the same into consideration and to remove the said Presbury from the office of Justice of the Peace

Whereas this Committee are informed by a letter of this date from Maj. Genl. Smith that "orders have been received from the war department to send off the 19 pounders on travelling carriages"—and as the Guns are the property of the United States and the carriages the property of the city of Baltimore—and as the Committee are of opinion that those Guns are indispensably necessary for the protection of this city—therefore—

Resolved That the Major General be and he is hereby requested to retain the Gun Carriages as the property of the City as long as they may be, by him deemed useful, and also that, he remonstrate against and do all he can to prevent the removal of Guns which are believed to be so important to our defence—

Mr. Payson from the Committee to whom was referred Maj. Genl. Smiths Letter requiring the Banks to place at the disposal of the Quarter Masters and Commissary's department a sum of money as mentioned in that communication, Reports That, the Banks of this city have accorded therewith, and that the money will forthwith be placed as required—

[103] Joseph Presbury, justice of the peace, 661-2 Bond St., dw. 19 Wilke St. [Eastern Ave.]

Resolved, That Mr. Stouffer and Mr. Bond be and they are hereby requested to have the nuisance immediately removed from the Circus, which is at present occupied by our Troops, and any expense in doing the same shall be defrayed out of the funds of this Committee—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 2d. September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Mr. Burke from the committee to whom was referred the Letter from the surgeons attached to Genl. Stansburys Brigade respecting certain conveniences for the army made report that upon enquiry the conveniences asked for were unnecessary and therefore they had not provided them: which report was received and concurred with—

Resolved That the Committee of Superintendants be and they are hereby directed to detail from the workmen of the third District tomorrow morning two hundred men, to be employed under the direction of Capt. Babcock and that on the following day the same number of men be detached from the fourth District and that the same plan be followed by the Districts in rotation—

Resolved, That the inhabitants of the 2d. 3d and 4th Wards in performing their tour of duty tomorrow, *Saturday,* are requested to assemble at the Court House, *Tomorrow morning at 6 o'clock,* as two hundred of them will be wanted to commence works of defence on Camp-look-out-Hill, near the Magazine under the direction of Capt. Babcock, and the remainder to progress with the works already commenced—and that the inhabitants of the 1st Ward and western Precincts will assemble for the same purpose at the intersection of Market and Eutaw streets, on *Sunday* morning at 6 o'clock—

Ordered That the foregoing Resolution be published for the information of the citizens forthwith—

Ordered, That so much of the Letter from the Major General as relates to Hospital surgeons be and the same is hereby referred to the Committee heretofore appointed to procure a Hospital for the sick, and that they comply as soon as possible with the request respecting Hospital surgeons and report to this committee—

Whereas it has been represented to this committee that the Regimental funds of the Baltimore Brigade have proved inadequate to supplying the same with music, and further that some of the commandants of Regiments have in part supplied such deficiency out of their private funds—therefore

Resolved, That one hundred dollars be paid out of the funds of this committee to each of the paymasters of the six Regiments composing Genl. Strickers Brigade to be applied in payment of music and that Genl. Stricker be furnished with a Copy of this Resolution—

Resolved, That, Mr. Burke, Mr. Stevens and Mr. Bond be and they are hereby authorised to fit up and prepare for service the Guns now under

the care of Mr. Beatty,[104] or any others, that may be deemed useful by the commanding officer, and that the expense thereof be defrayed out of the funds of this Committee—

Resolved, That Mr. Dugan, Mr. Berry and Mr. Alrecks be and they are hereby appointed to aid Mr. Brawner in converting the Flour and bread for the use of the Troops—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 3d. September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Mr. Dugan from the Committee appointed to aid in having the Flour baked into bread for the use of the Troops reported, That they had entered into a written contract with Francis W. Bolgiano [105] to bake bread for the use of this committee which was received, ratified, and ordered to be filed—

The Committee to whom was referred the requisition of Major Genl. Smith for six Hospital surgeons to attend on the sick and at the Hospital beg leave to report, That in consequence of the authority vested in them by the Committee of Vigilance and Safety they have appointed Doctor Colin McKinzie [106] Hospital surgeon and authorised him to appoint Doctors James Middleton,[107] Horatio Jameson,[108] William Turner, George Frick [109] and Charles Richardson assistants, who will be called into the Hospital as Doctor McKenzie may find their services necessary—They also beg leave to report that, when they visited the Hospital, they were informed by Mr. Gatchell [110] that he had received orders to procure groceries and medicines, but that some other articles would probably be required for the comfort of the sick, which your committee directed him to procure until an arrangement could be made to obtain them in a regular way, the appointments now made it is presumed will remove this difficulty—

Which Report was read and concurred with—

Resolved, That Mr. Stewart, Mr. Waters and Mr. Schaffer be and they are hereby appointed to have a bridge of scows from Pattersons Wharf, Fells Point, to the nearest land on the opposite shore, erected immediately, in the manner directed & requested by the Major General in his communication of this date and to report to this committee—

Whereas, The Commander has required still further aid from the citizens in completing the works of defence already begun and in erecting

[104] James Beatty (1770-1851), merchant and navy agent, McClure's Wharf.
[105] Francis W. Bolgiano (d. 1832), baker, 69 S. Frederick St.
[106] Colin McKenzie (1775-1827).
[107] James Middleton (d. 1818), physician, 12 N. Gay St.
[108] Horatio Gates Jameson (1778-1865), druggist, 16 N. Howard St. Later founder of the Washington Medical College and consulting physician to the Board of Health.
[109] George Frick (1793-1870).
[110] Jeremiah Gatchell (d. 1822), steward of Baltimore Hospital.

others, and it being highly desirable to expedite such works by every possible means, and the Committee of Vigilance and Safety feeling an entire and undiminished confidence in their fellow citisens; therefore—

Resolved, That the City shall hereafter be laid off and divided into two Districts; the first of which shall comprise all that part of the City together with the Eastern Precincts, East of Jones' Falls, and all the residue of the City with the western precincts shall compose the second District—

That all exempts, people of colour and others, able and willing to labour, of each District be, and they are hereby most earnestly invited and requested to turn out and labour on the works of Defence in their respective Districts on *Monday* next and every day thereafter they can find it convenient—

That Arthur Mitchell, Daniel Conn, Henry Pennington, John Chalmers, William Starr, Thomas Weary, Henry Harwood, Philip Cunmiller, John Price, Bazel Smith, John Gracy, John Schunck, John Smith, William Parks, Capt. Watts, Ludwick Herring, William Carman, Jacob Miller, Robert Fisher, John Gross, George Auckerman, John Mackenhumer,[111] Mr. Moran, Robert Wilson,[112] and Hezekiah Price [113] be and they are hereby appointed a committee of superintendance for the first or Eastern District—

That William Ross, Caleb Arnest, James Hutton, Frederick Leypold, William McClary, John McKim junr., Henry Schroeder, Alexander McDonald, Eli Hewitt, Peter Gold, Alexander Russell, William W. Taylor, Edward Harris, George Decker, William Hawkins, Isaac Philips, William Jones, John Hignet, Charles Bohn, Alexander Irvine, Ferdinand Gourdon, and Jonas Clopham, be and they are hereby appointed a committee of superintendants, for the second or Western District—

That each of those committees make such division of themselves, into sub-committees, appoint deputies, and make such arrangements as will best suit their own convenience, and ensure a faithful discharge of their duty—

That Richard Frisby, George Woelper, John Kelso, George Warner, Henry Stouffer and Adam Fonerden, members of this Committee be, and they are hereby requested to give notice to the persons appointed as superintendants in their several Districts, and to aid them with their advice and assistance—

The owners of slaves are requested to send them to work in the Districts in which they reside, and such of our patriotic fellow citizens of the country or elsewhere, as are disposed to aid in the common defence, are invited to partake in the further duties now required, at such times as may be most convenient—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 4th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

[111] John Mackenheimer (1754-1823), 42 Bridge St.
[112] Robert Wilson (1771-1844), cashier, Bank of Maryland, 15 South St.
[113] Hezekiah Price, lumber merchant, 58 Bridge St.

Resolved, That Mr. Stouffer, Mr. Berry & Mr. Jessup be, and they are hereby appointed to procure Palisades for the Fortifications now erecting on Camp-look-out Hill at the most convenient place and in the most expeditious way possible—[This entire paragraph was x-ed out, and the word "Error" inserted in the margin.]

Resolved, That the members of this Committee appointed to aid the superintendants be and they are hereby requested to confer with Capt. Babcock, the Engineer, as to the number of labourers and implements that may be wanted from day to day to carry on & complete the works of Defence, and that they be and are hereby authorised to provide the same—

Ordered, That the communication from the surgeons of the third Brigade of Maryland Militia lie on the Table—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 5th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceeding of yesterday were read—

Major DeFourville, an Engineer, who had hitherto aided in erecting works of Defence, on being introduced to the Committee tendered his services gratis to the citizens directing the erection of works proper for its defence, and also submitted some observations respecting the works already begun and others which were deemed necessary and proper—

Mr. Fonerden from the committee who were appointed to confer with Capt. Babcock: Reported that he had done so, that Capt. Babcock required two hundred hands on this day and would inform the committee of the number wanted from day to day and further that Capt. Babcock wanted a Horse to enable him to attend to his duties—therefore—

Ordered That Capt. Babcock be furnished with a Horse—

Resolved, That George Woelper be and he is hereby appointed a superintendant whose duty it shall be to hire one hundred labourers to be employed in raising breast works on the Road towards North Point for one week, as required by the communication of the Major General of this date and that said superintendant be authorised to hire said labourers on the best terms in his Power and to furnish them with Provisions and other necessaries and to furnish an account thereof to this Committee—

Resolved, That a Superintendant be appointed whose duty it shall be to employ labourers not exceeding one hundred and fifty per day to work at the Fort erecting at Camp-look-out; and that said superintendant is hereby authorised to pay to each labourer not exceeding one dollar per day, they finding their own provisions and liquor; and that he be also directed to employ as many Carpenters and Mechanics as the Engineer may judge advisable, whose wages shall not exceed one dollar and twenty five cents per day; and that said labourers, carpenters and other mechanics be continued until the works are completed; and an account thereof be rendered to this Committee: and that Isaac Philips be & he is hereby appointed a superintendant to carry on the abovementioned work under the direction of the Engineer—

Resolved, That a superintendant be appointed whose duty it shall be to employ labourers, not exceeding one hundred per day to work at the Fortifications erecting or about to be erected at the eastern end of the Town, and that said superintendant is hereby authorised to pay each labourer so employed a sum not exceeding one dollar per day, and to employ as many Carpenters and other mechanics as Major Armstead may deem adviseable, whose wages shall not exceed one dollar and twenty five cents per day, the said labourers and mechanics to accommodate themselves with victuals and drink; and that the said labourers Carpenters and other Mechanics be continued until the works are completed; and an account thereof be rendered to this Committee—

Resolved, That George Auckerman be the superintendant to carry into effect the foregoing Resolution—

Ordered, That the Major General be furnished with a Copy of so much of the report of the committe of the 3d. instant respecting the Hospital, as relates to the appointment of six Hospital Surgeons—

Ordered, That Mr. Fonerden be excused from further attendance as a member of this Committee to aid the superintendants, and that Mr. Jessup be & is hereby appointed in his stead—

The Committee then adjourned. [Inserted here is a slip, in another hand, reading: "The Requisition for Thirty Scows Was made on the fifth Day of September 1814 and Continued in Service untill thirtieth November in said year Comprising a period of Eighty Six Days."]

Baltimore 6th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That Mr. Jamison and Mr. Burke be and they are hereby requested to superintend the purchase and delivery of Lumber for the use of the Fortification: and to investigate the quality of that which has already been delivered—

Whereas in compliance with the requisition of the commanding officer, the Committee of vigilance & safety have supplied Capt. Babcock with labour to be employed in works on Camp-look-out Hill but they are apprehensive that Capt. Babcock contemplates Fortification more complete, more costly, and requring more time than the present exigency and the means of this committee will justify—therefore—

Resolved, That, the commanding officer be requested to give such instruction to the Engineer, as well procure for the western section of the city such temporary works as the time allowed us, the use to be made of the private property on which they are to be erected and the very limited means of this committee will justify—

Ordered, That Mr. Buchannan & Mr. Payson wait on the Major General with a Copy of the foregoing Resolution and confer with him respecting the nature of the works of defence contemplated and report immediately—

Mr. Buchannan from the committee appointed to wait on the Major General Reported that they had done so, and that they were informed by

the Commanding Officer that the works intended to be erected would be of such a temporary nature and such limited extent as the present exigency would admit of and no more—and that the expence would be met by the United States—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 7th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That so much of the Resolution of this Committee passed on the fifth instant as relates to the wages to be paid to the labourers and the number thereof, that may be hired to work on the Fortifications erecting on Camp look out Hill be and the same is hereby repealed and the superintendant is hereby authorised to hire such number of labourers and upon such terms as he shall think best—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 8th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That, the Committee of Accounts be and they are hereby authorised to advance to Mr. James Beatty any sum of money that he may want for the purpose of fitting-up and repairing Guns and Gun Carriages, not exceeding three thousand dollars—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 9th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That a sum not exceeding fifty dollars be paid out of the funds of this Committee to the Paymaster of the Rifle Battalion to be applied to the payment for music—

A communication was received from the *Committee of Relief*, requesting that, the contributions in provisions subscribed to this Committee should be transferred to the *Committee of Relief* to be by them disbursed among the poor and needy—which was read and ordered to lie on the table—

Mr. Frisby from the committee who were appointed to investigate cases of individuals who may be accused of being "in the constant habit of making use of very improper and intemperate expressions calculated to produce disunion, and to defeat the preparations making for the defence of our City"—made report of sundry improper & intemperate expressions of a certain Richard Lewis [114] of Pratt Street, which was read and ordered to lie on the table—

Resolved That the chairman of this Committee be and he is hereby authorised to pay the sum of twenty five dollars to Edward Miles for his

[114] Richard Lewis, Pratt nr. Hanover St.

trouble in assisting and bringing home Charles Ernest a Soldier who was wounded in the battle of Bladensburg—[115]

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 10th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Mr. Frisby from the committee who were appointed to investigate cases of individuals who may be accused of being in the constant habit of making use of very intemperate and improper expressions calculated to produce disunion and to defeat the preparations making for the defence of our City—made Report of sundry improper expressions and suspicious conduct of a certain Lewis Briers an alien enemy resident here by permission—whereupon

Ordered That the chairman of this committee be and he is hereby authorised and requested to have the said Lewis Briers immediately arrested and strictly examined and committed to prison if the chairman shall think proper—

The following address was moved and assented to

"Those who feel interested in the safety of Baltimore and who have omitted to subscribe to the fund which is placed at the disposal of this committee, are respectfully reminded that the subscription paper is still open at the Mayors office, that the expenses to be defrayed by the committee are unavoidably large and are for objects deemed by the Military authorities indispensable to our safety—

"The committee acknowledge with thanks the liberality of those who have contributed so freely to this important fund, but they deem it their duty to state that, although the subscriptions have been liberal, yet that, from estimates it is apprehended they will be inadequate to our wants and that, the subscription list comprises only about five hundred names—The committee are preparing for publication an alphabetical list of those who have aided them with their funds, and that, this may appear as speedily and be as respectable as possible they beg their Countrymen to be prompt in their subscriptions—["]

Ordered That the foregoing address be published immediately—

Ordered That when this committee do adjourn they shall be adjourned to tomorrow morning nine o'clock—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 11th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved—That Messrs. Wm. Wilson, Burke, Camp, Stevens, Schaffer,

[115] Charles Ernest, ship carpenter, was a member of the Fell's Point Rifle Corps. He was still abed in June, 1815, when an appeal was made in the newspaper for assistance to this wounded veteran.

Taylor, Lorman and Waters be and they are hereby appointed to procure as speedily as possible thirty or more ships or vessels and to deliver them to Commodore Rodgers for the purpose of Having them sunk near Fort McHenry in such manner & place as the Commodore shall direct, as required by the Major Generals communication of this date—

Resolved, That Messrs Hollingsworth, Jessup, Warner, Berry and Alricks be and they are hereby authorised and required to provide immediately Tents and Camp equipage and to supply the wants of the Militia of the third Brigade and for that purpose to appoint such number of superintendants as they may deem necessary—

Ordered That the Committee heretofore appointed to provide a Hospital be and they are hereby required to supply the wants of the sick and wounded at present, until another arrangement can be made and a supply can be had in the regular way, of such articles as are said to be wanted in the communication of the Hospital surgeon of this date—

Ordered That Mr. Kelso and Mr. Frisby be and they are hereby required to procure forthwith such number of labourers to work on the Fortifications to the eastward of the City as the Engineer can employ—

The Committee then adjourned to 4 O'Clock P. M. of this day—

Baltimore 4 O'Clock P. M. 11th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment. The proceedings of the forenoon were read—

It was stated that a certain man named Maxwell has of late conducted himself in a manner so as to excite suspicion that he has or intends to have some intercourse with the enemy—therefore—

Ordered, That the chairman of this committee cause the said Maxwell to be arrested immediately & imprisoned during the present time of alarm—

Capt. Thomas C. Jenkins [116] appeared and offered the services of his Company of exempts in any way that they could be most usefully employed—

Resolved, That Capt. Jenkins, Capt. Mackenheimer and Capt. Lynch [117] be and they are hereby requested to divide their companies into sections and to lay off the city into districts so as to suit their convenience and to patrole the city and suburbs every night during the present time of alarm—And that Mr. Stouffer inform Capt. Lynch and Mr. Bond inform Capt. Mackinheimer of the proposed arrangement—

Resolved, That the committee appointed to superintend the works of defence be and they are hereby authorised and required to call on all able bodied free men of colour to turn out and labour on the Fortifications or other works; and in case of refusal to call on the commanders of the several companies of exempts to assist in enforcing such persons to turn out and labour—

The Committee then adjourned to 8 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

[116] Thomas C. Jenkins (d. 1834), 47 S. Charles St.
[117] John Lynch (1763-1848).

Baltimore 12th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment— The proceedings of yesterday afternoon were read—

Whereas it is represented to this committee that it will contribute very materially to the preservation of good order in our City, if the retailing of spirituous liquors were prevented after a certain specified hour of the night; therefore—

Resolved, That the Mayor be and he is hereby requested to cause all Taverns except those for the accommodation of Travellers, and all those Houses where spirituous liquors are retailed to be closed at 9 O'Clock every night and to remain closed during the night—

The committee then adjourned to three O'Clock P. M. this day

Baltimore 3 O'Clock P. M. 12th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment— the proceedings of yesterday afternoon were read—

Resolved, That Mr. Mortimer [114] be and he is hereby authorised and directed to remove the sick Family at Mr. Sterlings place,[119] formerly Hustlers Garden, immediately at the expense of this committee

The committee then adjourned to 8 O'Clock of this evening

Baltimore 8 O'Clock P. M. 12th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment— The proceedings of the afternoon were read—and nothing being communicated or proposed for adoption the committee adjourned to 8 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

Baltimore 13th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—

The committee received a verbal communication from the Major General, requesting that, they would have the provisions of our fellow citizens in arms cooked every day for them during the actual investment of our city by the Enemy; therefore—

Resolved, That the several members of this Committee be and they are hereby requested to have as much of the provisions for our army cooked in his own Family and also by others, every day, as he possibly can during the present emergency—

The committee then adjourned to 3 O'Clock of this day—

Baltimore 3 O'Clock P. M. 13th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment— The proceedings of the forenoon were read—

The Major General informed the Committee by a verbal communication

[118] Thomas Mortimer (1771-1828), carpenter, York nr. Forest St.
[119] William Sterling, grocer, 11 Baltimore St.

that, the troops under General Douglas command were in want of provisions: therefore—

Resolved, That Mr. Bond be and he is hereby requested and directed to send provisions immediately to the Troops under General Douglas command—

Resolved, That Mr. Payson be and he is hereby authorised and requested to purchase for the use of the Army, on the best terms he can, of Mr. Robert Barry [120] all the provisions he has on hand—

The Committee then adjourned to 8 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

Baltimore 14th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Mr. David Willie came before the committee complained that his waggon and team had been pressed and prayed that it [be] released—The committee took the complaint under consideration and promised relief as soon as possible

The committee received a communication through their chairman from Major Armstead requesting this committee to furnish him with two hundred shovels one hundred Pick axes and five hundred Pieces of Timber eight feet long and one foot square, for the purpose of erecting bomb proof covered ways for the protection of the soldiery stationed at Fort McHenry: therefore—

Resolved, That Mr. Payson be and he is hereby authorised and requested to have one hundred Pick axes and two hundred Shovels collected immediately and sent to Fort McHenry—

Resolved, That Mr. Burke and Mr. Taylor be and they are hereby authorised and directed to procure five hundred pieces of Timber eight feet long and twelve inches square and with all possible dispatch to deliver them to Major Armstead at Fort McHenry—

The Committee then adjourned to 3 O'Clock P. M. of this day—

Baltimore 3 O'Clock P. M. 14th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of the forenoon were read—

The Committee received a verbal communication from the Major General requesting, that, two Fire Ships should be prepared and delivered to Commodore Rogers forthwith; that carriages should be sent to bring home the wounded: and that a party be sent to bury the Dead—therefore—

Resolved, That Mr. Burke, Mr. Schaffer and Mr. Stevens with Mr. Joseph Smith [121] the Harbour Master, be and they are hereby requested to provide two Fire Ships; say old sloops or schooners filled with light wood, tar and other combustible matter and to deliver them with all possible dispatch to Commodore Rodgers—

[120] Robert Barry (d. 1838), merchant, 12 Spear's Wharf, dw. Water St.
[121] Joseph Smith, harbor master, 16 Pitt St.

Resolved That, the Members of this Committee will immediately press and procure Hacks or other Carriages to bring our wounded men from the battle ground—

Resolved, That Mr. Buchannan, Mr. Payson & Mr. Frisby be appointed a committee, whose duty it shall be, first to provide for the immediate internment of such of our brave fellow citizens as have fallen in the late attack on this city and further to provide for such funeral Honors as becomes the duty of the living to pay to the brave and virtuous Dead—

Ordered, That the foregoing Resolution be published—

Resolved, That Mr. William Wilson and Mr. Frisby be and they are hereby directed and requested to wait on Major Armstead and know of him whether he would require any other ships to be sunk near Fort McHenry—

Resolved, That the Superintendent theretofore appointed to aid in the Fortifications at Camp-look-out be and he is hereby requested to furnish the Engineer tomorrow morning with as many labourers and Carpenters as he may require, and to continue the supply of labour and mechanical aid until the work is completed—

The following letter was read agreed to and ordered to be forwarded—

To the Deputy Commissary of Purchases

Sir—

The opportunities which we have had of observing the injury to the public service by the absence of the Deputy Commissary of purchases and the public Storekeeper induces us to assume the privilege of recommending that those important officers may not permit their military to interfere with their Staff duties, but on the contrary they remain to discharge the latter—

The Committee then adjourned to 8 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

(*To be continued*)

ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATION IN THE UNITED STATES [1]

By Frank B. Jewett

When, one hundred years ago today, Samuel F. B. Morse, over his experimental electromagnetic telegraph line, sent the now historic words, "What hath God wrought," not only over the wires between Baltimore and Washington but down the channels of Time itself, a great new era in the development of human society was inaugurated.

The forces first released and set on the march on that spring day a century ago have created entirely new problems requiring new solutions and new adaptations in practically every undertaking, whether in peace or war, in which gregarious man is involved.

Chronologically, telegraphy was the first great useful application of electricity. For over thirty years it was the *only* substantial use. Then in the late 1870's and almost simultaneously, two other applications of great potential utility, viz., telephony and electric power, which sprang from the same root stock as telegraphy, i. e., the Faraday and Henry experiments, took form and began to grow apace. We are not here concerned with the history of electric power generation, transmission and utilization, but we are concerned with Alexander Graham Bell's invention of the telephone and the art which developed out of it and which was destined in a few short years to become the dominant factor in the field of electrical communication.

Toward the end of the century the two arts of telegraphy and telephony began to influence each other under a double urge. These were (a) the enormous scientific and technical strides for-

[1] Digest of a paper presented before Maryland Historical Society, May 24, 1944; and before Sigma Xi Society, University of Chicago, June 1, 1944.

ward which the onerous requirements had brought about in telephony and (b) the obvious by-product values to telegraphy which such strides had automatically produced. It was toward the end of this era also that the ultimate economic places of the two arts in the field of electrical communication began to become clearly envisaged.

An Achievement of Private Enterprise

The story of the development of electrical communications in all its infinite ramifications is one of the great sagas of human evolution.

In any panoramic picture of a hundred years of electrical communication in the United States we will find all sectors of it—telegraphy, telephony and radio broadcasting—involved at one time or another or continuously, with the same principal factors but in varying degrees. In each, however, there has always been, from the start, one factor common to all and absent for the most part in other countries. It is a factor which has had a powerful influence in raising electrical communication in the United States to its position of unquestioned preeminence, both technically and as a tool of maximum utility in the social structure.

Here, as practically nowhere else in the world, the development of electrical communication has always been a private enterprise. Invariably regulation by the State has followed a very substantial uncontrolled development and has been imposed only when usage has become so great that the service was tinged with a large public interest which the State could not neglect. Generally speaking, the objective of State regulation has been to insure adequate service at reasonable non-discriminatory rates which, while protecting the public against exploitation, would not impose obstacles in the way of that full development and use of new tools and methods which are the hallmark of a free enterprise system.

Some Fundamental Concepts

Properly to appraise any picture of development in the several fields which constitute present-day electrical communication and of the interrelations between them, it is desirable to keep clearly in mind two or three simple distinctions and one common misconception. The misconception is found in the designation of radio

as something distinct from telegraphy and telephony. In a technical sense all radio, including broadcasting, is either telephony or telegraphy which employs free transmission of electromagnetic waves through the ether rather than transmission from transmitter to receiver guided by wires.

The simplest and most generally applicable distinction between telegraphy and telephony is that telegraphy is a form of intelligence transmission by electrical means in which the meaning of the message is transmitted to the brain of the ultimate recipient through the mechanism of his eyes. In telephony, on the other hand, it is transmitted through his ears. In general also telegraphy is a rapid form of intelligence transmission analogous to mail, in that it involves one or more intermediary human beings in the transmitting chain between sender and recipient. With telephony, on the other hand, after the transmission channel is established, communication is directly between sender and recipient, without intermediaries, as it would be in a *vis-à-vis* conversation. In telegraphy also it is sufficient merely to have the received energy in the same sequence of energy packages as is sent out by the transmitter. Within limits it is not required that the form of packages be the same.

In telephony, on the other hand, it is imperative that the *form* in which the energy is received at the distant end of the circuit deviate but little from its *form* at the sending end. If this is not so, there is distortion which, if substantial, destroys the context of the intelligence, no matter how great the received energy.

It is these basic characteristics of each form of communication that explain why those who launched the telephone on its corporate career had little experience to which they could appeal, and why there were to be fundamental differences in the business practices of the two industries.

Commercial Growth

After Morse's demonstration, telegraph lines came into being rapidly. Initially they were relatively short and disconnected. Gradually, as they increased in number and the art progressed, they began to merge into systems of communication, and the systems into still larger systems, all directed, consciously or unconsciously, toward the goal of a universal service.

Here in the United States this process went on until there were but two systems (the Western Union and Postal) which persisted essentially competitive for the general message business of the nation long after any benefits of competition had ceased to exist. It is only within the past few months—a hundred years after the Baltimore-Washington demonstration— that final merging into a single nationwide system (the Western Union Telegraph Company) has been made and a monopoly of the message business under private ownership and management, with Government supervision, established.

Parallel with the growth of general message systems, various specialized telegraph services grew up and continue to exist. Some of these are operational adjuncts to other services, such as railroads; others involve furnishing of private message facilities to large users having unique needs, such as press associations or industries with widely scattered interests. And in recent years a special telegraph service available to both large and small users has been made possible through the application of certain telephonic techniques and facilities. This is a switched printing telegraph service—TWX—which is now employed by a multitude of subscribers throughout the nation.

Telephony, like its older brother telegraphy, also went through an evolutionary process. It started in a small way in many separated places and gradually, as the art advanced and the separate small units expanded their radii of operation, they met and coalesced into larger units, and these later into yet larger ones. It was a natural evolution which grew out of the nature of telephony—not a series of combinations fostered by outside forces.

While the inherent physical limitations of the earliest telephone instruments dictated the initiation of telephony in numerous isolated places, there were from the beginning two factors which destined growth of what is now the integrated Bell System to follow a different path of growth from that of telegraphy.

These two factors were:

(a) realization that if the goal of uniform satisfactory commercial service over wide areas and ultimately over the whole nation was ever to be realized, standards of performance, particularly of the terminal apparatus, i. e., the transmitter and receiver, must be rigidly maintained; further, that they

must be maintained through a mechanism which would permit readily of supplanting old instruments with more efficient ones as these latter emerged from progress in the art; and

(b) the fact that vastly greater sums of money were required to establish telephone rather than telegraph systems. This latter factor was intensified by the rapidity with which the urge for telephone service spread to town and city and later to village and countryside.

Basis of Good Public Service

Confronted with these two problems, the owners of the fundamental Bell patents had to decide what to do about ownership of the instruments and how best to raise the vast sums of money required for plant.

The first was solved by deciding to retain ownership and furnish the terminal apparatus to the operating companies on a license or royalty basis; the second through the incorporation of separate companies, each licensed to operate exclusively in a determined area. In most of these companies the parent Bell organization had stock ownership and supplied part of the capital—the remainder being supplied locally.

This ownership and maintenance of instruments by the parent company was adhered to for many years—long after the basic Bell patents had expired. It was the rock on which the whole laborious climb toward a universal and uniformly good nationwide service was based. It was not discarded and the instruments sold to the operating companies, like all other plant items, until the progress and control of the physical development of the art and the gradual realization of uniform policies in the several operating companies had progressed sufficiently to make clear to all the wisdom of centralized guidance.

For if this vision of nationwide and worldwide telephony were not to prove a tantalizing will-o'-the-wisp, far-reaching decisions concerning business policy had to be made and then faithfully adhered to. For instance, if some day New York was going to talk not only to Buffalo and Pittsburgh, but to Chicago and Omaha and Denver and San Francisco—and, likewise, Chicago and Omaha and Denver were to be able to talk to San Francisco—a nationwide uniformity of telephone equipment and tele-

phone operating practices would be needed. When these broad desiderata were translated into working arrangements, they led the pioneers to the concept of centralized engineering, to centralized research and development, to centralized manufacture, and to centralized ownership of patents; in other words, they led uniquely to the articulated group of corporate parts which characterizes the Bell System and which is as well adapted to its task today with over 20,000,000 telephones in the country as it was when there were 20,000.

Viewed from the broad base of our present knowledge this System may seem so natural, almost so inevitable, as to excite little wonder. But when we project ourselves back to the meager electrical art of 1885 and remember that at that time this art had had little or no chance to express itself in business structures, we realize that it was a high order of organizing genius which planned so that no false moves and no back-tracking would be needed at a later time.

Reaction of Telephony Upon Telegraphy

While the problems of telephony are in many respects different from those of telegraphy and so tend to different or even divergent modes of commercial development, there are three dominant factors on the physical side which pull irresistably to bring the two services together. Many of the mechanisms and operating methods of telephony are applicable in simpler form in telegraphy; likewise there are transmission values in all telephone circuits, automatically produced but not needed in telephony which can be used for telegraphy simultaneously. Further, since the standards of construction and maintenance which telephony imperatively requires are higher than those needed in telegraphy, telegraph circuits obtained by use of the telephone plant are extremely reliable.

The Telephone Companies did not attempt to handle a telegraph message business. This would have required a commercial setup different from that employed in connection with the telephone, and would have introduced a violent element of competition into the field already occupied competitively by the telegraph companies. But with only minor increases in central office equipment and in personnel, the long distance telephone

lines could be used for "leased-wire" and other special telegraph purposes without in any way interfering with the availability of these same lines to telephone subscribers.

But we are more interested in the benefits accruing to the telegraph from telephone research and which have multiplied rapidly with the years.

Subsequent to 1900 the proven value in the field of fundamental science research of what has been loosely termed the scientific method of attack was recognized as a powerful implement applicable also in the industrial field. From this recognition have grown the great industrial research laboratories which, like Bell Telephone Laboratories, now so largely determine industrial progress. This determination results not alone from a more rapid fashioning of keystones but likewise, through the rigorous controls which their methods require, a lessening of abortive attempts to advance an art too rapidly.

So firmly has the value of the industrial research laboratory in the electrical communication field been established during the past forty years, that it is inconceivable now that any branch of the art can progress effectively without it.

The dream of a universal telephone service adequate at all times was and is today the driving force behind all the research and development work that is going on at Bell Telephone Laboratories. This is because the ideal cannot be attained unless the physical problems are solved and solved at a price which is low enough to permit full use of the service.

Involved in this ideal are:

(1) Distance anywhere must not be a barrier.

(2) The service must be available anywhere any time on demand.

(3) It must approach as nearly as possible "no delay" service, i. e., establishment of the desired connection while the calling party is at the telephone.

At the moment, carrier current transmission, by which many messages can be transmitted simultaneously over the same pair of wires, has taken us a long way toward the ultimate goal. By means of the carrier technique any telephone channel could be adapted to convey eighteen or more telegraph messages simultaneously. But more than this, the telephone line itself could be

pyramided in such a way as to transmit, at first three, and today twelve to sixteen separate and independent telephone conversations.[2] To recapitulate, a pair of wires which in the early days of the telephone could carry but a single conversation, can now carry sixteen conversations. Or, if all of these telephone channels should perchance be wanted for telegraph purposes, then the single pair of wires could convey over two hundred telegraph messages at one and the same time.

Quest of a Telephone Repeater

And before universal service could be attained there was urgent need of a telephone repeater or amplifier to restore energy to the line periodically. Moreover, it was appreciated that once a successful repeater was at hand, it would be the open sesame to the then untried potentialities of radio transmission.

Then too, the storm breaks of important open wire lines were becoming increasingly annoying. The best recalled instance is the sleet storm which isolated Washington on the day of President Taft's inauguration. It led to the ultimatum from Vail to his engineers that they must find some way to put long distance telephone lines underground or in some other way protect them from storm damage. The first notable answer to Vail's challenge was the opening of the Boston-Washington underground cable in 1912. It gave commercial transmission but it stretched the use of large wires and loading coils to the limit.

Triumphs based upon the repeater came in rapid succession. The first transcontinental telephone line was opened commercially in January, 1915 [3] and vindicated all the expectations which had been associated with the thermionic vacuum tube. In the fall of that year the same group of engineers transmitted the voice from Washington across the Atlantic to Paris by radio telephone. Longer cable circuits than the original Boston-Washington group, and employing the vacuum tube amplifier, were shortly to appear. Today, such a cable spans the continent. The carrier form of transmission, as I have already mentioned, led to

[2] The exact number of carrier channels, both telegraph and telephone, derived in practice is primarily determined by economic rather than physical factors.

[3] The first actual conversation from New York to San Francisco was six months earlier. The story of this transcontinental line is one of the great chapters in the history of electrical communication.

multiplexing, almost beyond the dreams of avarice, until on a single coaxial cable employing but two conductors, we transmit four hundred eighty telephone messages at the same time.

It was inevitable that out of this energetically expanding research program, knowledge, methods and devices of major importance to the telegraph art should arise. As a matter of fact, the telegraphic by-products of telephone research were, and continue to be, major contributions to the advancement of telegraphy.

I shall not attempt a complete itemization but I do want to mention a few instances because they are essential to an understanding of the story from here on. These developments spurred on by the growth of the telephone, have affected, or will in the future affect, many phases of telegraph practice, such as the terminal instruments, the lines of transmission, and the philosophy underlying the operation of the lines; and, finally, the facilities and practices for switching the lines.

A promising contribution of telephony to the telegraph art is the facility for rapidly switching or interconnecting lines that is so necessary to telephone service. The combination of rapid switching with the printer telegraph is the basis of the TWX service mentioned earlier.

With this type of service two individuals or offices can intercommunicate very quickly, and can if they wish converse together, not by the spoken word, but by the written word, each typing out his comments as the exchange of ideas progresses, the charge being determined by circuit time rather than by the number of words sent, as is common for message telegraphy.

Undoubtedly, one of the most spectacular scientific contributions of telephone research in recent years to the telegraph art is the permalloy loaded submarine cable. The copper conductor of this cable carries a winding of high permeability iron alloy tape which imparts a very beneficial magnetic quality to the cable that is not possessed by earlier examples of the submarine cable technique. This magnetic layer surrounding the copper does for the cable about what loading coils have long done for land telephone lines. To sum the matter up in very few words, a transatlantic permalloy cable has about five times the message capacity of the older style non-magnetic cable. Various permalloy loaded cables are now in successful use throughout the world.

My last illustration of a contribution from the newer to the older art will refer to the carrier current developments which, as mentioned earlier, permit of rather fantastic multiplexing of various types of circuits. One of the essentials of modern carrier practice (and of modern radio transmission also) is the so-called electrical wave filter, an invention of Dr. George A Campbell, now retired, but formerly of the engineering staff of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The wave filter can take many forms, sometimes being built of coils and condensers, and at other times of thin slabs of crystals of quartz, of Rochelle Salt, or of other substances—but however constructed, it permits of almost knife-like electrical separation of messages at the receiving end of a circuit, almost as though they were printed on a strip of paper and then slit apart with a pair of shears.

The practical value of carrier transmission, and therefore of the wave filter, increases with the sharpness of discrimination which it permits between messages. As mentioned earlier, these modern telephone techniques make it possible, for instance, to transmit as many as eighteen telegraph messages together in a circuit which will carry a single telephone message. This obviously represents an important circuit economy. The practice has been extensively employed in telephone plants during recent years as a means both of securing telegraph channels for leased wire and TWX circuits and, on occasion, for providing facilities to the message telegraph companies.

Post-War Technology

Any reference to the post-war world would be conspicuously incomplete without a word, at least, regarding the technological possibilities that seem to be forthcoming. So far as concerns electrical communication, many of these are encompassed in that now portentous word "electronics." This is a field which in certain respects has been definitely advanced as a result of war research and of the wartime applications of pre-war research. In general terms, this work has made much higher frequencies available for practical uses. The electrical spectrum has been extended usefully upward, thereby adding very materially to the number of ether channels that are available for overland communication. The shorter radio waves which are transmitted at these frequencies, travel only in straight lines, and do not hug the curved surface of

the earth as do the very long waves, nor are they reflected from the upper ionized layers of the earth's atmosphere, as are the so-called short waves of present-day radio transmission.

On the other hand, these ultra-high frequencies which will shortly become available, can, like a searchlight beam, be readily pointed in any desired direction, thus conserving energy and minimizing one of the present causes of interference, between radio stations, namely, that their generated energy spreads out either in all directions, or through a considerable angle. What the ultimate value of ultra-high frequency directed radio will prove to be is now largely conjectural. Some of its possibilities are inherently very attractive, however, and it promises to be assiduously explored and tested once the war is over.[4]

From what I have already said, you will understand that transmission channels secured in this way will be of equal use to both the telegraph and telephone. Perhaps a more immediate application, however, will be made to television and to facsimile, where it can furnish the means for broadcasting visual or graphic programs throughout any local area, much as broadcasting does for sound. Further development will also disclose the relative places of repeatered broad band carrier systems on wire guides and by radio in main trunk routes.

The present prospect is, therefore, that there is still a vast future for the application of scientific research to the advancement of electrical communication. The first century has brought us a long distance on our way, but the final goal as yet is nowhere in sight.

Considerations of Public Policy

Turning from the scientific to the public policy aspects of the communication art, time does not permit more than mere mention of some of the many juridical and semi-juridical problems engendered by rapid and enormous growth.

Principal among these have been the methods by which the State has sought to supervise equitably a vast public service performed by private agencies rather than by the State itself.

[4] Since this address was delivered the Federal Communications Commission has approved an application of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company to construct a directed beam radio system between New York and Boston.

Long before regulatory bodies representing the public had come into existence, several of the state legislatures debated the expediency of putting a ceiling on the monthly charge that could be made for a telephone. So far as I know, the first and actually the only State to act was Indiana, which in 1884 passed a law stipulating that the monthly charge for a single telephone could not exceed $3.00 and that if any subscriber had two telephones the monthly charge for each was to be $2.50. The bill was passed over the protestations of the young telephone companies then operating in Indiana and, as it soon developed, against the interests of the people of Indiana. As the law made impossible any operating profit, it demoralized the telephone personnel and at once froze the sources of money needed for further expansion. It is not surprising, therefore, that the State legislature rescinded its hasty action within twelve months or so, and their unhappy example served as a warning to other legislative bodies.

Many years later came the first of the quasi-judicial regulatory bodies or Commissions whose functions, methods and powers are still in an evolutionary state.

And more recently, broadcasting has grown in an incredibly short time to a great industry, a great public interest and a great social problem. In every sector it has posed new questions whose importance is so great and whose impact so violent as to create veritable storms both of inquiry and controversy.

While application of this form of transmission to the ordinary problems of telephony and telegraphy has altered their methods and expanded their fields of service, adaptation would not be difficult if this were all that science and technology had injected.

When, however, the full utilization of radio as a unique method of broadcasting intelligence is brought in on a huge scale, all the older problems have to be reappraised in the light of the new art. In addition there is introduced the element of a new competition in news and information dissemination. Likewise, the age-old question of freedom of speech and of the press arises anew in sinister form because necessary control by the State of the mechanisms of transmission, if chaos is to be avoided, offers both the possibility of censorship and, more, the allegation that it is sought to be imposed by the State.



ISAAC VAN BIBBER

(January 17, 1810—September 28, 1847)

From a portrait made about the time of his tour through Central and Southern Maryland. Owned by Mrs. J. Alexis (Harriet Van Bibber) Shriver.

A MARYLAND TOUR IN 1844: DIARY OF ISAAC VAN BIBBER

Contributed by J. Alexis Shriver

[The Van Bibbers came originally from Utrecht, Holland, and settled on part of " Bohemia Manor " in Cecil County, Maryland. Some of the descendants of these settlers moved to Baltimore, and went into the shipping business at Fells Point, then a rival of Baltimore, but now part of it. They were very successful, and built a handsome house on Thames Street, the woodwork of which was secured in recent years by J. Alexis Shriver, and taken to his home at " Olney," Harford County, Md.

After having amassed considerable money at Fells Point, Washington Van Bibber (1778-1848) and his wife Lucretia Emory, moved to " Avondale," in Carroll County, Md., a few miles beyond Westminster, and took up the home of Legh Master, who had an iron furnace there, and who in a fit of anger pushed one of his colored servants into a burning furnace.

While at Avondale the Van Bibbers, through Isaac Van Bibber, just 100 years ago—1844—as a result of his collections, built the Episcopal Church in Westminster. All the Van Bibbers of Avondale are buried in this church yard, and there they reinterred the body of Legh Master, originally buried at " Avondale."

Dr. W. Chew Van Bibber, one of the brothers, however, moved to Baltimore, and was for many years a very successful doctor on Franklin St., residing where the present Y. M. C. A. building now stands. Miss Alice Van Bibber, one of his daughters, lives on Bolton Street, Baltimore.

Isaac Van Bibber was born January 27, 1810, studied law and was admitted to the bar; spent three years in European travel, returned to " Avondale," and died there September 28, 1847.—J. A. S.]

[DIARY OF ISAAC VAN BIBBER] [1]

On Wednesday the 6th of March I set out upon an expedition, concerted between Mr. Buel [2] and myself, and approved of by the other members of the family, to collect money to aid in building our Episcopal Church in Westminster.[2a] The morning was a delightful one, and in so far the heavens appeared propitious to the enterprise. I was mounted upon Chew's mare, and bound to Sykesville, with the intention of proceeding thence to Baltimore to obtain credentials from the Bishop.[3] Little occurred previous to my arrival at Sykesville worth mentioning, excepting that I fell in with two whirlwinds and Jacob Null. I must give the former the credit of saying that during the short time they favoured me with their society, they exhibited far greater liveliness and vivacity than the latter. Indeed, I am compelled to add that Mr. Null would have been much more appropriately designated if, instead of *one* name, he had followed the example of Lord Brougham and Vaux, and adopted the highly significant title of Null and Void.

As Mr. Garratt [4] was not at home upon my arrival in Sykesville, and most of the doors appeared to be locked, I enjoyed an opportunity not to be neglected of ascertaining by repeated measurement the number of paces in the hall and portico of the hotel. At length Mrs. Garratt appeared, and as I was ravenously hungry, I requested dinner immediately. She curtesied very politely, and requested to know whether I would have fish or beefstake. I was about to say *both*, and had some faint thoughts of suggesting the addition of a veal cutlet, but reflecting that such a reply would

[1] The valued services of Miss Lucy Leigh Bowie in preparing the notes are gratefully acknowledged. Thanks are also due Miss Anne Armour Perkins for information relating to Carroll County families and to Mrs. Douglas Thomas for help with those of Prince George's.—Editor.

[2] Rev. David Hillhouse Buell, native of New York, who was at this time rector of Holy Trinity and Ascension Churches, Carroll County, Md.

[2a] Ascension Church, Westminster, Rev. Richard M. Lundberg, rector, celebrated its centenary in the spring of the present year and on August 27, last, unveiled a plaque in grateful remembrance of the efforts of Mr. and Mrs. Washington Van Bibber and two sons, Isaac and Thomas, in serving the Church.

[3] Rt. Rev. William Rollinson Whittingham, a native of New York, Bishop of Maryland, 1840-1879.

[4] Garratt and many others mentioned have proved too difficult for ready identification.

hardly have been delicate under the circumstances, and moreover that I was upon an errand of the Church, and that this was the season of Lent, I therefore uttered with sorrowful forbearance—fish. Shortly after, Mr. Garratt made his appearance, and in answer to my salutation of "how he did?" very obligingly gave me an account of all his complaints for the last six months, and then by an easy and perfectly natural transition passed over to a very minute detail of the purchase, wearing out, and final abandonment of a most remarkable overcoat. While he was in the midst of this intensely interesting narration, a black woman entered and said something to him in a low tone of voice, but he proceeded without paying the slightest attention to her communication. It occurred to me that dinner was announced, and I felt very sorry to be compelled to interrupt the story in one of the most thrilling passages, to inquire whether it were not so. On receiving a reply in the affirmative, I proceeded immediately in the direction of the dining room, but Garratt followed close behind and during the greater part of the meal regaled me with the account of his adventurous overcoat. After dinner, I took a short nap; got into the cars about 4 o'clock; arrived in Baltimore without incident or accident; took tea at Whitman's,[5] and having such a headache as to prevent my visiting anywhere, attended one of Professor Silliman's lectures upon Geology.[6] This was an admirable discourse beautifully delivered. From the lecture I went to Aunt Emory's, where I met Wm. Lindenberger and after waiting until about 11 o'clock, admitted Chew and went to bed in his room. N. B. saw Miss Courtney.

Thursday, March 7th. After breakfasting and making a few purchases, Chew and I called on the Bishop, who received us kindly, and after reading Mr. Buel's letter, promised to give me a circular recommending my undertaking to the liberal and charitable of his diocese. He and Mr. Hewitt[7] appeared quite well. After leaving the Bishop's, Chew and I directed our steps towards the Medical College;[8] although Chew was obliged to stop on the way and put up a box of pills. This detained us so

[5] Presumably William Whitman's Eagle Hotel, Pratt St. east of Light.
[6] Benjamin Silliman, professor of chemistry and natural history at Yale.
[7] Rev. Nathaniel Augustus Hewitt, native of Connecticut, in 1844 rector of St. John's Church, Huntington (Waverly), Baltimore.
[8] Of the University of Maryland.

long that we found considerable difficulty in getting into the crowded amphitheatre where the Commencement took place. Degrees were given to more than 30 young men. The circular hall was completely crowded with ladies, and such were the noise and confusion that scarcely anything could be heard. There were two or three pretty women to be seen, but I could discover very few traces of intelligence in the countenances of the graduates. The music was not bad. After the commencement I went to dine with Frederick Brune, who met me on the street and gave me an invitation; in the afternoon I went to see John Brune [9] at the Counting House; and at night attended a lecture, and afterwards a supper at Dr. Dunbar's.[10] The Doctor delivered a valedictory to four of his students, who had graduated at the commencement, presenting them at the same time with a certificate of proficiency, and giving them a world of good and wholesome advice, interspersed with occasional touches of the pathetic and the facetious. The supper was cold but the welcome warm. I made out my meal principally from pound cake and pickled oysters. Such was the profusion of beef upon the table that I was inclined to think that the Doctor had been sacrificing a hecatomb to Æsculapius. Also, it was a first rate dish—was chicken salad. After supper I returned to Aunt Emory's; slept like a top; was waked at 6 o'clock the following morning, March 8, and perceiving that it was a rainy day, determined to remain until a later hour, or, if the bad weather continued, all day. After breakfast, I took a solemn leave of my Aunts and cousins, and determined, even if I remained in town that day, not to show myself among them again; I dislike too many leave-takings. Having bought myself an umbrella, I walked about the streets or lounged in book-stores, until a suitable dinner hour, when I repaired to Robinson's oyster house [11] and took a simple but exquisite repast—the fact is, I'm a great oyster-man. After eating, I continued to sit in the little apartment, reading, writing and cyphering for an hour or two,

[9] Frederick W. Brune (1813-1878) and John C. Brune (1814-1864) were sons of Frederick W. Brune, Sr., who came to Baltimore from Bremen in 1799. The younger Frederick was one of the founders in 1844 of the Maryland Historical Society.

[10] Dr. John R. W. Dunbar (1805-1871), removed to Baltimore from Winchester, Va., in 1830.

[11] Thomas Robinson's ale and oyster house, according to the city directory for 1844, was at 6 Light St.

when, at last I heard a great noise in front of the house, and on inquiry found it to proceed from a crowd of people assembled about a live leopard, which, getting loose from its keeper, who was parading it about the streets, had inflicted a severe injury upon a child which happened to be within its reach. Leaving my coat and books upon the table, I went into the common sitting room, where, after I had satisfied my curiosity in regard to the leopard, I seated myself beside the stove and continued to read. Shortly afterwards I put on my great coat and went into the street. Wishing to purchase one or two articles, I went into a shop, and having made a selection, I put my hand in my pocket in search of my pocket-book. Not being able to find it, after a long search, I went back to the Oyster House, where after hunting in vain for some time, I had the landlord and all the servants assembled and stated to them my loss. They all, of course, looked very blank. At last, however, I discovered the object of my search in a pocket I had not previously examined; and then no doubt looked exceedingly blank in my turn. I should have mentioned that yesterday evening I saw Nannie and found her looking much better than when I had last seen her during the winter. At night I slept at Dix & Foggs.[12] Fog was very attentive to me and insisted upon my drinking a glass of wine with him. I found it, for so damp a night, an excellent antifogmatic. Dix I didn't see. I was aroused at an early hour of the morning.

March 9, 1844, and had my head well combed and my clothes well brushed previous to starting from the hotel. Breakfast, if such it may be called, I took at my friend Whitman's, and insisted upon paying for it. I mention this circumstance, because that valuable friend had refused to receive payment for my occupying a room during 24 hours after my first arrival in town. Immediately after breakfast I entered the cars, and read and shook and grunted until I arrived at Sykesville. Here I met with Mr. Warfield,[13] who very pressingly invited me to come to see him. At the same time I met Mr. Sykes,[14] who gave me permission to put his name down on my subscription list for 10 dollars. Leaving

[12] Dix and Fogg kept the Fountain Inn, on Light Street, site of the present Southern Hotel.

[13] George Frazer Warfield, who built "Groveland" at Sykesville. Warfield, *Founders of Anne Arundel and Howard Counties*, p. 170. This and other local sources have been freely drawn upon in these notes.

[14] Probably the mill-owner James Sykes, for whom the town was named.

Sykesville I rode immediately to Mr. Patterson's, whom I found at some distance from his house, sitting on a log reading a newspaper.[15] I asked him to read what I had written up on the first page of my subscription book, but instead of doing so, he asked me what it was all about. I told him it related to the building of an Episcopal Church in Westminster, at which he shook his head, saying that he would have nothing more to do with the building of Churches, as he looked upon them as causes of contention in the neighborhood. I then hazarded a few words of expostulation, and told him that I would most gratefully receive anything that was offered. To this he made no reply, pretending to be deeply engrossed with an exquisite representation of some steam cars at the head of one of the columns of the newspaper. Finding his thoughts in such *a train*, I bid him good morning, and receiving a very polite salutation in reply, rode away. Thus vanished my golden dream of a handsome donation from the wealthy Mr. Patterson.

From this place I rode direct to Mr. Ireland's about three miles distant.[16] To my application that gentleman professed himself a Methodist and said that if it were necessary he would give $500.00 to insure the building of such a church in his neighbourhood. Mr. Ireland was seated with his hat on, at a little side table eating a private meal. He told me that he was so afflicted with rheumatism in the head that he was obliged to keep that precious knob carefully bandaged up, and that to secure the bandage in its place he was obliged constantly to wear his hat. The fact is he appeared nervous and hypocondriac to the last degree. On rising to take leave he insisted upon my remaining to dinner, which, without much entreaty, I consented to do. Shortly after, I was introduced to a Mr. Renwick, a Methodist preacher, and son-in-law to Mr. Ireland. Mrs. Ireland and two of her daughters appeared at the dinner table, which was very abundantly supplied with excellent provisions. After dinner, Renwick and I got into a theological argument upon the subject of the apostolical succession; during the course of which Mr. Ireland, notwithstanding his Methodism,

[15] George Patterson, of "Springfield," Carroll County, brother of Betsy Patterson who married Jerome Bonaparte. His property is now the Springfield State Hospital.

[16] Edward Ireland, Sr. (1795-1871), who married Deborah Moale. He was own brother to Jesse Hollingsworth (see below) but took the name of his maternal grandfather for a consideration. Information from Miss Ann Armour Perkins.

seemed inclined to advocate my side of the question. At length, I mounted my horse and went over to Mr. Jesse Hollingsworth's,[17] who lives in sight, about quarter of a mile distant. Jesse was not at home when I arrived, but being sent for he soon made his appearance, and gave me a warm and hospitable reception. He has residing with him as governess a young lady named Miss Badger, somewhat of the apple dumpling order of beauty, fat and healthy in the extreme. This young lady, perhaps owing to her extreme rotundity, has revolved completely round in her religious notions, and from a Presbyterian has become a complete high-churchwoman. She insists, I believe, upon being rebaptized previous to being confirmed. I found Mrs. Hollingsworth very kind, and indeed spent a very agreeable evening with the family.

March 10 Sunday. Shortly after breakfast this morning I rode to Mr. Colhoon's [18] accompanied by Mrs. Hollingsworth. I found Mr. Colhoon deeply engrossed by church matters, going two or three degrees higher than ever I expect to ascend. This is accounted for by the fact that Mr. Colhoon was originally a Presbyterian. He appeared to be well informed upon church history and upon all matters relating to the question which is at present agitating church people. With Mrs. Colhoon I was very much pleased. She appears to be a highly intelligent and sensible woman,—high church in her notions, but withal liberal and charitable. During the three or four hours I remained at this place our conversation was entirely upon church matters. It was maintained however with great animation and interspersed with numerous anecdotes. About 4 o'clock I again set out, and shortly before sunset arrived at Mr. Warfield's. Here, I received a warm welcome, and also three names to my subscription list. Miss Susanna and Wm. Henry [19] sang and chanted; and the old man dwelt upon the reminiscences of by-gone times until he was thrown into a terrible panic, by a little negro boy getting under a side table, and by his noises inducing a belief that a ferocious bandit, or, at least, a sanguinary housebreaker, was in the room.

[17] Jesse Hollingsworth (1800-1872) of "Weston," Carroll County, whose wife was Sophia Baker, was a son of Judge Zebulon Hollingsworth.

[18] Mr. Colhoon was from Philadelphia and married Miss Ireland of "Upton."

[19] Susanna and William Henry Warfield were the children of George Frazer Warfield of "Groveland." Susanna was an author and musician. William Henry Warfield, a graduate of West Point, left "Groveland" to the Episcopal Church and it is now known as "Warfield College."

With the exception of this little romantic incident the time flowed smoothly away until the hour of bed, when I sank into a sweet sleep under a silken coverlid.

March 11, 1844, Monday. At the hour of [not given] I started upon my feet, and indulged in the rarity of a clean shirt. Then, after breakfasting, I made an early start intending to visit Mr. Harrison's [20] and several of his parishioners during the day, but various causes prevented my accomplishing the latter part of my plan. In the first place, I lost myself two or three times, upon the road leading from Sykesville to the Frederick Turnpike; then, I was obliged to ride back a considerable distance for my umbrella, which, upon stopping, I had deposited very carefully beside a tree; and, finally, I thought myself bound to stop at a tavern to write a letter home—not having written since I left there, and finding a great difficulty in writing at private houses. At the tavern I also took a bite and attended to my mare. I reached Mr. Harrison's about two miles distant, about 4 o'clock, and found him in the act of driving out upon some business at Ellicott's Mills. He insisted upon my alighting and remaining with him all night. During the time of his absence, I enjoyed the company of Mrs. Harrison, her sister Miss Thompson and Mrs. Hammond; good company, though somewhat stiff. Harrison himself is perhaps a most excellent man—certainly he is exceedingly kind and hospitable—but from the cast of his countenance, one is led to infer that he is in a constant state of the most ferocious passion. This is attributable, doubtless, to dyspepsia and great emaciation. I believe, however, that his character is remarkably mild and amiable—would to heaven he looked it a little better! Mrs. Hammond soon took her leave, and the rest of the evening was spent by Mr. Harrison and myself in an agreeable literary chit-chat. He seemed to be a hard student and has a considerable knowledge of the German, of which he got me to translate for him several difficult passages. After writing a page or two in my journal, I retired about 11 o'clock, and rose about half after 6 the next morning.

March 12, Tuesday, when, immediately after breakfast, I repaired to Ellicott's Mills about 2 miles distant. The first person

[20] Rev. Hugh T. Harrison, native of Talbot County, was in 1844 rector of St. John's Church, Howard County. He was born in 1800 and died in 1862. His wife was Elizabeth Catharine Thompson (1813-1892).

I met was Meade Addison [21] come to attend court at this place. Addison was exceedingly kind and friendly to me; subscribed $10.00 to our church, and introduced me to every one who was at all likely to contribute. I attended court during the whole day, and picked up from different individuals about 30 dollars. Everybody was very polite even when they refused to contribute, which was the case with Hammond and Hayden.[22] In the evening Addison and I visited Mrs. Phelps,[23] the preceptress of the female academy, who, after a long and prosy palaver, came to the conclusion that she could give me nothing. She was, however, profuse in her politeness, and invited us to take tea with herself and girls, when, no doubt she would have given us the taste as well as the smell of bread and butter. I am sorry that we felt constrained to decline so Byronic a gratification. It rained nearly all day to-day, so that I was obliged to confine myself pretty closely to the house, i. e., the Court house. A case was tried in which my friend Brent [24] acquitted himself quite handsomely. He spoke for about an hour with great fluency and (considering the uninteresting nature of the subject), quite well. Lawyer Tyson's [25] speech was in the highest degree amusing—owing principally to his grotesque gesticulations. The fact is, he made the most eloquent mouths I have ever seen displayed before an intelligent jury. They greatly contributed, I have no doubt, in influencing the verdict.

March 13, Wednesday. It rained until about 10 o'clock, and afterwards cleared up very beautifully. I lingered, however, in the hope of obtaining a few more contributions, but with the exception of Mr. Alexander,[26] of Annapolis, who gave me $10.00,

[21] William Meade Addison was the youngest son of Rev. Walter Dulany Addison. The former was U. S. District Attorney for Maryland under three administrations. Addison, *A Hundred Years Ago, Life and Times of the Rev. Walter Dulany Addison*, p. 189.

[22] Edwin Parsons Hayden, son of Dr. Horace H. Hayden of Baltimore. He practised law at Ellicott's Mills, where he built the stone residence, "Oak Lawn," near the Court House.

[23] Almira Hart Lincoln Phelps (1793-1884) the distinguished educator and author, principal of Patapsco Female Institute, Ellicott City, from 1841 to 1856. She was the mother of the late Judge Charles E. Phelps of Baltimore.

[24] Probably Robert James Brent (1811-1872) member of the Constitutional Convention of 1851 and attorney general 1851-1852.

[25] Judge John S. Tyson, who married Rachel, daughter of John Snowden of "Birmingham." He lived at "Mount Ida" on the hill at Ellicott City.

[26] Doubtless this was Thomas Harwood Alexander (1801-1871) a distinguished lawyer, who was an associate of Judge Theodoric Bland. He removed about 1852 to Baltimore.

I was unsuccessful. I applied to two Messrs. Dorsey, brothers of the Judge,[27] and to Mr. Ben Harrison,[28] but they pleaded the necessity of giving all they had to spare to relieve their own parish from a debt of 1200 dollars, for the erection of the parsonage-house. In the evening, I took a long stroll with Brent along the banks of the Patapsco. During our ramble we talked over all our reminiscences and adventures in Winchester, Va., where we had both studied law together. He gave me a particular account of his courtship of a certain young lady, his refusal, his subsequent acceptance, and the final dissolution of partnership, by mutual consent; to all which matters I was privy at the time, but many of which I had since forgotten. Brent is a great talker and quite agreeable. At night Addison and I went to get some oysters, which, had they only been half rotten, we might have eaten for politeness sake; but as they went rather beyond that delicate state, we were so fastidious as not to relish them.

March 14, Thursday. About 9 o'clock I again started upon my way, having picked up about $40.00 at Ellicotts Mills. I rode along the romantic banks of the Patapsco as far as Elkridge Landing, about 8 miles, where I knocked at the door of Dr. Worthington's [29] house, to inquire for the Episcopal clergyman residing there. No one coming to the door after I had knocked repeatedly, I rode on two miles further, when finding it 12 o'clock, I stopped at a tavern to have my horse fed, and to take a little snack on my own account. Here I was told that the road to Annapolis was very difficult to find, but that I could obtain conveyance for myself and horse upon the railroad, about 10 miles distant. Thither I repaired, after a slight meal of eggs and crackers. When arrived at the relay house, I was told that there was no car suitable for transporting horses, but that I might send a boy from Annapolis and have my mare ridden down by the country road. This plan being the only one left me, I set out in the car for Annapolis, and reached it though distant twenty miles, in less than an hour. The railroad appears to be very well constructed, but passes through one of the dreariest and most poverty stricken countries I ever

[27] Brothers of Chief Justice Thomas Beale Dorsey were Caleb, Edward of Kentucky, Col. Charles Samuel Worthington Dorsey, and John Worthington Dorsey, Jr.

[28] Benjamin Harrison of Baltimore married Ann Caroline, daughter of Benjamin Harwood.

[29] Dr. Hattersly P. Worthington, father of the late George Worthington, architect of Baltimore.

saw. The appearance of an abundance of round pebbles, in the soil, between this and Elkridge, shows that this part of the country was originally under water. Whether it emerged gradually from the sea, by the same process as that which, at the present day, elevates the coast of Sweden, or whether it was suddenly thrown up by some volcanic eruption, we have no means of ascertaining. I was induced to think of the subject at all from the wonderful effects of subterranean fires and other agencies spoken of by Professor Silliman in his lectures. I arrived in Annapolis about 6 o'clock and put up at Swan & Iglehart's, to all appearances the best hotel in the State, out of Baltimore.[30] The rooms and staircases are all carpeted, the servants attentive and polite, and everything conducted more after the English than the American model. Feeling somewhat fatigued, I retired rather earlier than usual.

March 15, Friday. Immediately after breakfast, I took a long walk without my great coat, without being aware, before I left the house, how cold it had become. This, I imagine, gave me a bad cold, which made its appearance towards evening. It commenced raining about 10 o'clock and continued during the remainder of the day. At first, I called upon Mr. Winslow,[31] who insisted upon subscribing $5.00, although I told him I was not begging from the clergy. He told me that the best way of inducing his parishioners to subscribe was to set them the example; and recollecting Chaucer's description of the good curate, I yielded to his generous motive. I then called upon Mrs. Harwood,[32] and afterwards, her daughter, Mrs. Tilten, both of whom declared themselves unable to give me any assistance. They received me, however, with politeness, and Mrs. Tilten was very pressing for me to dine with her. I next called in succession upon Mr. Cornelius McLane, who could give me nothing, upon Mr. Thomas Franklin, who also declined contributing, upon Dr. Humpfries[33] of St. John's College, who sent me a dollar by the servant, and

[30] This was the City Hotel, formerly Mann's Hotel, where Washington and other notables had put up in earlier days. It stood at Duke of Gloucester and Conduit Streets.

[31] Rev. Gordon Windslow, D. D., rector of St. Ann's. He was a native of England.

[32] Mrs. Henry Hall Harwood was a daughter of Col. Edward Lloyd of "Wye House," Talbot County. Her daughter Josephine married Edward G. Tilton, U.S.N.

[33] Rev. Hector Humphreys, D. D., native of Connecticut, became President of St. John's College in 1831 and died in office in 1857.

upon Mr. A. Randall,[34] who first declined, but was afterwards induced to give me $5.00. It rained so hard during the remainder of the day, and I felt so badly, in consequence of my cold, that I kept to my room, where I occupied myself in reading and writing. With the exception of Mrs. Harwood and Mrs. Tilten, I am a total stranger in the place—and strangers appear to be so common here that very little notice is taken of them. Even the landlord and bar-keeper, by their reserved and business-like manners, seem to look upon strangers as not exactly what they are cracked up to be.

Saturday, March 16. My cold being somewhat increased, and the rain continuing to fall even faster than it did yesterday I thought it more prudent to keep the house during the forenoon, which in one respect was a great pity, as the barber in brushing my hair, had made me look considerably sprucer than usual. My mind was greatly agitated to know in what part of my book to insert Dr. Humphrie's dollar. If I put it down in my list which contained no sum less than $5.00, it would considerably prejudice my future prospects—not to insert it at all, in the proper place, would perhaps be somewhat insulting to the Rev^{d} and learned President. After long and painful deliberation, I came to the conclusion to leave a line for the Dr., but not to fill it up until the $5.00 charm was dissolved, or, if that continued unbroken until the end of my journey, not to insert it until I reached home. I may remark, however, in passing, that I did not call upon the Doctor with any intention of begging, but having pinned my visiting card upon the Bishop's letter, I generally sent it in to make known my business at the same time that I announce my name; my object in calling was to see the college. In the evening I took a walk, but felt so badly and so little in the humour for begging that I dispensed with that highly agreeable occupation. After reading and writing until quite late, I retired.

Sunday, March 17, St. Patrick's Day. Although travelling on horseback is not exactly like travelling in a banbox, still a man may be neat, if he's only clean, and I feel proud to say that I never had a nicer feel about me than when I came out of the barber's hands this morning. To be sure I was obliged to snuffle

[34] Hon. Alexander Randall, member of Congress, Attorney General of Maryland, 1864; president, Farmers National Bank, Annapolis.

a good deal now and then, but that only afforded me an opportunity of displaying my snow white silk handkerchief, as upon tiptoe, like a french dancing master, I tript up to the venerable looking brick church at the head of the street. The building is immensely large in proportion to the ordinary size of the congregation; although it may do very well during the session of the Legislature. Mr. Winslow has an excellent voice, read the service very effectively, and preached a very sensible sermon. He appears to be an excellent man. In the afternoon I took a stroll over the whole town, seeing the garrison,[35] the Governor's house, the house which formerly belonged to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, where at one end of the garden are to be seen what is very rare in this country, some interesting relics of antiquity in part of a ruinous building, in which a handsome marble doorway and the remains of a marble balustrade, seem almost tumbling into the water. There are a great many fine old houses in the town; some of them, no doubt, built during the colonial government. They have an English and aristocratic air about them, such as is seldom seen in our more modern structures. " I like them much." On my return from walking, while waiting in my room for the supper bell, the servant entered and announced Dr. Humphfries. I flew down to welcome my dollar friend, and brought him immediately to my room. It seems he had some how or other, conceived that I must be a clergyman, and I was very sorry that I felt myself conscientiously bound to undeceive him. In the account he gave me of his misconception, he had me so intimately blended up with Mr. Buel and Dr. Risteau,[36] that, at the conclusion of it, I felt hardly certain of my own personal identity. Feeling, however, pretty much as I always did, and not at all like either of those gentlemen, I concluded the mistake lay upon the side of the Rev. and learned President, and then proceeded to explain to him the precise nature of my undertaking. To this he listened with commendable patience. At last I produced my book, and apologized to the Dr. for my omission to insert his name, honestly avowing that I did not wish to dissolve the $5.00 enchantment, which seemed to have taken possession of my list, whereat the Dr. very generously handed me 4 dollars more, and then inscribed

[35] Fort Severn which occupied a part of the present grounds of the Naval Academy.

[36] This appears to have been Dr. Thomas C. Risteau (d. 1866) of Baltimore Co.

his name before the necromantic figure. The bell now rang for tea, to which I hospitably invited my guest; but the learned President had supped; he said he had taken coffee, but in saying so he made such a *rye* [sic] face, that I was compelled to suspect the genuineness of the article, having myself, at one time, been accustomed to college fare. In return, the Dr. very politely invited me to visit him tomorrow, a little after 9 o'clock, when he promised to take me over the institution. With this hopeful prospect before me, I shall retire to bed with a light and happy heart.

Monday, March 18. I arose this morning with a determination to proceed with energy; and accordingly, immediately after breakfasting and barberizing, I dashed out, list in hand, to make an attack upon the social circles of Annapolis. The first lady upon whom I determined to make an impression was Miss Brice,[37] without knowing what sort of a lady I should meet, whether old or young, handsome or homely. It was sufficient for my purpose to know that she was thought wealthy, and that she was the possessor of an immensely large house, which only required a little paint for to be converted into a sumptious palace. In my own mind, I determined to furnish the paint at my own expense, as well as any little carpenters work that might need repair; and it was in the full glow of such generous schemes that I was ushered into the parlour, and requested to wait until Miss Brice made her appearance. This she did in about three quarters of an hour, during which, there being no fire in the room, I was enabled to contemplate with perfect coolness the panelled walls, and admire the antique fashion of the furniture. With this last the lady's appearance corresponded to a nicety. If society were geologically stratified, she might be considered as belonging to the primitive formation, with, however, a few fossiliferous remains of a nearly extinct species of calcareous shells in the upper region. Slender, bland and seductive, she appeared bearing the Bishop's letter and a five dollar note clasped tightly upon her bosom, a spot which, under such circumstances, even "Jews might kiss and infidels adore." Being neither one nor the other, I contented myself with keeping a tight eye upon the ragged but tempting prize;

[37] Mistress of the famous Brice House, a floor plan and front elevation of which appear on the fly-leaves of the book in which Van Bibber kept his diary.

while in tones, which for their blended rapidity and sweetness, deserve, perhaps, to be called *quick-silvery*, she apologized for not being able to bestow more for so noble a purpose. Having seen this much of Miss Brice, I felt a longing and irresistible inclination to see Miss Chase. The former lady pointed out her residence to me from her back windows, and thither I immediately repaired, in a condition which resembled more than anything else, the appearance of an extinct volcano. Before I reached the large and venerable house, however, I was all ablaze, and again carried an imaginary paint pot in my hand and an imaginary carpenter's rule in my pocket. Ample time was allowed for my fervor to cool in a room destitute alike of volcanic, solar, or artificial heat, until at length the elder Miss Hester Chase [38] swam into the apartment. At first sight, it appeared as if one of the old portraits hanging around had gently sunk into the wall, made a slight change of costume, silently reappeared, and gracefully descended from the frame. She was a lady who seemed to blend in the happiest manner the most contradictory elements; she was dignified, though short; intellectual, though fat; motherly, although a maiden. She, too, even in the strictest keeping with her furniture, the low but stately chairs, the pursy but elastic sofa. In her fair hand she bore a coin of virgin gold—the quarter of an eagle. Alas! my game of fives was at an end. I had striven long to keep the ball in motion, but Miss Chase's authoritative name as the donor of two dollars and fifty cents was indelibly emblazoned upon my book. You might have seen the gold enter into my soul, as with smiling lips but quivering chin, I thanked the fair contributor and bowed myself away. I entered next the enclosure of the garrison, a beautiful place, most beautifully kept. Here, I presented my papers to Major Gardiner, the Commandant, a fine looking man, of pleasing manners, who appeared very sorry that he could not afford to give me anything. As a justification he even went so far as to commence revealing some causes of pecuniary embarrassment, which I was so considerate as to interrupt. He appears to be a very amiable man, and is, no doubt, like his namesake, of historical memory (the Colonel), a brave but generous, a firm but tender soldier. From the garrison I

[38] Hester Ann Chase (1791-1875), daughter of the Hon. Jeremiah Townley Chase and his wife Hester, daughter of Thomas and Agnes Baldwin.

directed my steps to the opposite quarter of the city, and there made my first application to a Mrs. Captain Voorhees, whose appearance and environment suggested to my mind the idea of Flora in deshabille. Her windows were decorated with the most lovely flowers, her person with the most unlovely robes. It was evidently her husband who followed the water—not she. It was also evident that she expended all the soft soap she had to dispose of in her conversation—the hand article she kept treasured in her bosom. She gave me her kindest wishes in words of honey and of treacle, but could not bear to part with so congenial a companion as filthy lucre. From Mrs. Voorhees I proceeded to the house of Mrs. Ray, whom I found sitting with dishevelled locks, in a most interesting and disconsolate state of widowhood. Although no longer young, she was still handsome, and finding that the maiden ladies whom I had visited were no longer to be thought of, I began to turn my attention to widows. Having presented my letter, I watched her until she had finished it; and then commenced a long and eloquent address, to which she appeared to listen with the most intense attention; smiling at times as though she were equally pleased with the matter and manner of my discourse. With rising hope, my heart began to expand. I drew my chair closer, and infused into my tones a tenderness sufficient to dissolve a glacier. The answer came at last—and with it came a death blow to my hopes. The lady was evidently [deaf]—she hadn't heard a word I uttered. And what was still worse—notwithstanding the lady failed to discover a particle of humour, she kept me in a roar during the whole time I was conversing with her. I roared, however, to some purpose, for the lady responded to my call to the tune of five dollars. The next gentleman I visited was Col. Manadier,[39] an octogenarian gentleman of the old school, very courtly in his manners, and, after the manner of old men, highly loquacious in his conversation. He seems to have been a first rate man in his day and generation. He introduced me to a lady (without naming her) as his niece—I had no means of ascertaining, therefore, whether she were married or single. As, however, she had quite a large face and quite a little turban over it, I felt but little curiosity about the matter. The

[39] Col. Henry Maynadier (d. 1849 at 91 years of age), owned "Belvoir," near Annapolis, afterward home of Hon. Brice John Worthington.

Colonel, at length, ponied up to the $5.00 notch, and I left the house fully determined in my own mind, whatever sacrifice it might require, never to attempt unravelling the interesting ambiguity which hung over the condition of his (to me) nameless niece. I next went into the store of George E. Franklin, whom I found behind the stove, engaged in the contemplation of a very ingenious and beautiful windmill, in miniature; which, when in operation, alternatively elevated and depressed a number of lilliputian personages, who, to judge from their countenances, seemed highly delighted with the sport. Whether or not it was the influence of this invaluable machine, the fact is he found no difficulty in raising the wind, and I left his store with $5.00 more than when I entered it. Nothing could exceed the delight with which Dick Gill [40] gave me five dollars, and Mr. James Iglehart, though ordinarily hard of hearing, was not at all deaf to the Bishop's appeal. In the afternoon, I rode out to the residence of Richard McKubbin, about two miles from town. This young gentleman resides in a beautiful situation beyond College Creek, his house being situated upon the summit of a lofty hill, and commanding a view of Annapolis, the adjacent country and the distant bay. The house is old, however, and the room into which I was ushered almost destitute of furniture. There was a bottle upon the table, at which my host seemed to have been occupied (I mean the table, not the bottle), containing some dark colored liquid, which I charitably supposed to be molasses. He gave me five dollars without a murmur. During the day I had called upon one or two persons who declined contributing, but as Dante says: "Non parliam di lor, ma guarda e passa." On my return from Mr. McKubbins I visited Mr. Winslow, to tell him of my success and to take leave of him. He was very polite to me. I then visited and took tea with Mrs. Harwood, where, also, I met with Mrs. Tilten. These ladies treated me with all the politeness and civility I forced out of them and with no more. I retired early and slept till late

On Tuesday morning, March 19, 1844. At the breakfast table I sat opposite to an old man, very coarsely clad, whom I took to be a rustic. When he left the room, however, the servant informed me that it was lawyer Macgruder, the father of a young

[40] Apparently Richard W. Gill, son of John Gill of Alexandria, Va., and his wife Ann E. Deale, daughter of Capt. James Deale of Anne Arundel County.

man whom I had seen lounging about the tavern ever since my arrival. . . . The old man returned quite opportunely, in a few minutes, and putting on his spectacles seated himself very deliberately to read the newspaper. I thought the Bishop's letter would be as new to him as anything else, and accordingly took the liberty of laying it before him. He perused it with great attention, looked over my book, and with a deep sigh gave me five dollars. I now prepared for departure. My bill was enormous; so much so that I was induced to look over the items and found mistakes to the amount of nearly $5.00 which I compelled the book-keeper to rectify. I firmly believe the imposition was designed. The morning was exceedingly cool as I bounded over the hills in the direction of South River ferry. Scarcely a stone, except now and then a few rounded pebbles, was anywhere visible. The soil between Annapolis and the river appeared to be very poor. The ferry is more than half a mile wide, and the three colored oarsmen were at the same time drunk, noisy and talkative. One of them dug up for me upon the beach a little shell fish called a mannenose, highly esteemed in these parts as a table luxury. Its place is indicated by a small hole in the sand, beneath which it lies to the depth, generally, of about half a foot. It resembled very much in appearance the clam. After crossing the ferry I pursued a public road, interrupted at least every quarter of a mile by a gate, frequently crossing a field without a fence upon either side, but more frequently having a fence upon one side of the way, but rarely upon both. It was in this neighborhood that I met a procession of negroes, about 14 or 15 in number, men, women and children, all bearing pieces of wood, nicely balanced upon their heads. The first two or three who passed had very moderately sized turbans, and although my mare once or twice started back aghast, she bore it upon the whole like a heroine; but when the coiffure was augmented to several yards in length, beautifully decorated with knots and branches, the sensitive animal could stand it no longer; she whirled suddenly round and fled precipitately away. I succeeded, however, in rallying her at last, and charged gallantly by the black headed phalanx in the direction of Mr. Brande's house[41] where I arrived about 12 o'clock.

[41] Rev. William F. Brand, a native of Louisiana, who became rector in 1842 of All Hallow's, Anne Arundel County, and in 1849 of St. Mary's, Harford County.

That gentleman recognized me immediately; invited me in, showed me several literary curiosities, gave me an excellent dinner, and accompanied me about two miles on my way in the afternoon. He may, without exaggeration, be called an oddity. Before dining, he invited me upstairs to wash my hands, and showed me little frames for hanging towels of his own workmanship—decidedly the ugliest things of the kind I had ever seen. His wife and sister were absent on a visit in the neighborhood. To this place he also rode in the afternoon, with a valise behind his saddle, stuffed perfectly full. Knowing that probably he did not intend to remain longer than a few hours—certainly not longer than the next morning, I asked him the reason of this. He told me he thought it would be a saving of time to take his clean clothes with him, instead of waiting at home until he could put them on. Not one word of encouragement did he give me to make a collection among his parishioners. I therefore passed through, shaking off the dust of my feet, whenever said dust interfered with the brightness of my boots. I arrived at Mr. Morsell's about 4 o'clock.[42] This gentleman's hospitable reception amounted almost to ectasy. When I mentioned my object, he jumped into it to the tune of $100.00 assuring me that I would not pick up among his parishioners a cent more or less than that specific amount. He gave me an account also of numerous extinct volcanoes, all of which were formerly to have blazed forth for the glory and prosperity of Westminster. What a blessed privilege but to peep into their silent craters! Mr. Morsell is an excellent man, amiable, kind and hospitable, and withal excitable and benevolent. It is dangerous, however, to attempt to fire him in favor of any cause whatsoever, by reason of his having one of the very finest hair-triggers ever touched in behalf of benevolence. Such precipitancy gives rise to sudden professions which are seldom realized and often repented of. I think indeed that Mr. Morsell began to repent before he sought his pillow, for finding me somewhat of a *churchman* in my speculative views (would I could say my religious ones!) his fevor in our behalf seemed gradually to relax. As Mr. Morsell has stepped exactly into old Mr. Chesley's shoes [43]

[42] Rev. Joshua Morsell, a native of Calvert Co., was in 1844 rector of St. James', Anne Arundel County.

[43] Rev. Wm. F. Chesley, also a native of Calvert County, was rector of St. James' from 1830 until he died in 1843 and was succeeded by his son-in-law.

(having married the daughter of that reverend gentleman, the former rector of the parish) he knows exactly where they pinch. Far be it for me to presume to point out the tender spot. Mrs. Morsell appears to be a very lively, amiable woman, who laughs at nothing and at everything. She seems to look upon the bright side of life, and to find it a perpetual joke. I believe that if you should crook two of your fingers at her at the same time, it would be her death. Her sister, Miss Mary, appears equally amiable. She looks very much like Sally Owen in her loveliest moments might be expected to look, if viewed through a pane of exceedingly uneven glass. Mr. Morsell thinks there is a great likeness between his wife and Mrs. J. Brune.[44] The resemblance would indeed be perfect if Mrs. Morsell could be viewed through the medium of a two inch pine plank. Mrs. Chesley, poor woman, is very deaf, and her son, the Doctor, very dumb—I mean taciturn; otherwise he appears to be a very sensible and amiable young man. Another son had chills; otherwise he too, appeared to be a very sensible and amiable young man. In fact, I was highly pleased with the whole family. Morsell and I talked till a very late hour. Indeed, the length of that gentleman's tongue may be looked upon as a natural curiosity.

Wednesday, March 20. With the assistance of a map made by the fair hands of Mrs. Morsell, I set out immediately after breakfast, upon a begging expedition. Mr. Ed. Hall, upon whom I first called, not being at home and the young lady who spoke to me seeming to look upon all introduced gentlemen as dangerous and perfidious monsters, I was obliged to pursue my route to the residence of Mrs. Waters. This fair but portly widow tempted me with an apple, " and I did eat." She seemed to have some indistinct notion that Carroll County was situated somewhere within the bounds of Anne Arundel, a prejudice which I was very glad to have it in my power, by the exhibition of my travelling map, to disabuse her of. After searching a long time for writing materials, she at length requested me to make her a pen, wherewith she *subscribed* five dollars to our church. I next visited the house of Mr. Jas. Kent, whose wife received me, in the absence of her husband.[45] If possible, her manners were colder than her

[44] Mrs. Brune was Anne Letitia Coale, daughter of Edward J. Coale, publisher and bookseller of Baltimore.

[45] Probably a son of Gov. Joseph Kent.

parlour. She heard what I had to say, and seemed to think it likely she would mention it to her husband. She has, entire, a beautiful set of teeth of the most approved manufacture—so says the parson's wife. At first I thought they were the product of her own gums. The next person I visited was Mrs. Gott, an elderly lady, who wore about her neck a rappee colored handkerchief [46] to correspond with what she seemed to be in the habit of inhaling. With such a beautiful display of harmonious adjustment, it will readily be concluded that the lady was up to snuff. The consequence of which was that instead of five I received another split ticket of two dollars and a half. From this place I rode to Dr. Cheston's, who, being unwell, Mrs. Cheston received me, with becoming warmth in a cold parlour.[47] She took my book and the Bishop's letter upstairs, and kept them at least three-quarters of an hour. When she returned, however, I was amply compensated to perceive an addition of $10.00 to the column. Mrs. Cheston very much resembled Kitty Sullivan, but as Kitty has a very sour, and Mrs. Cheston a very sweet face, the similarity may be illustrated by the resemblance which a lemon in its natural state bears to one beautifully encrusted with sugar. From this place I cantered over to Mr. Harry Hall's. This gentleman's "house is seated on a rising ground," commanding on one side an extensive inland view, and on the other a prospect of the Chesapeake, and even of the Eastern Shore. Mr. Hall, an elderly man of genteel appearance, with light colored hair, half sandy and half gray, is very deaf. In reference to myself and my mission, he exhibited himself as, at once, open handed and close fisted. He very politely insisted upon my remaining to dine with him, but seemed principled against subscribing his name to any donation. He promised to give something, but I doubt if he ever recollects it. Mr. Wilson, whom I next called to see, was away from home. I therefore returned with all haste to Mr. Morsell's, arriving at the same moment that Mrs. Kent and her daughter drove up to the door. They came to attend prayer-meeting and a lecture, which takes place every Wednesday evening at Mr. M's residence. A number of persons were assembled, and Morsell *Methodized* without being at all in rule. During

[46] Rappee, a coarse kind of snuff.

[47] Dr. James Cheston of "Ivy Neck" in 1844 married, as his third wife, Sally Scott Murray, daughter of Daniel and Mary Dorsey Murray.

the day I collected about $30.00. The evening we spent in sociable chit-chat.

Thursday, March 21. As soon after breakfast as I conveniently could I took an affectionate leave of Morsell and his family, and mounted upon my cantering Rosinante, proceeded in the direction of Mount Pleasant ferry over the Patuxent on the way to Upper Marlborough. The morning was cool, and the air exceedingly raw. When I had gone about three or four miles, I met a countryman walking along the road, from whom I requested directions for my onward route. These he gave me with all the politeness imaginable; until at last a sudden idea seemed to strike him, and giving me a significant look he said he knew I was from the City, and that he was well aware what sort of a character I was. When I begged him to explain, he said, " you're one of those Collectors." I acknowledged the com[pliment]. I felt conscious that I was a collector. I told him so. Without waiting for any further explanation, he bolted off, and all my entreaties could not induce him to return and complete the direction he had commenced. I presumed he thought me one of the collectors of the direct tax, and knowing himself to be a defaulter, made off as rapidly as possible. I then dismissed the matter from my thoughts. After riding forward a mile or two, I happened to look around and discovered a man on horseback with a very ferocious aspect, and carrying a gun upon his shoulder, who was gaining rapidly upon me. The thought instantly struck me, how imprudent I had been in giving the countryman to understand that I was a collector. I felt convinced that he had hurried away from me to apprise one of his confederates of the fact; and that this man now riding in pursuit was intent either upon robbery or vengeance. I felt no particular desire to be made an actor in either the one or the other of these sanguinary transactions—especially as the great solitude of the place would render it exceedingly uninteresting as a " tableau vivant "—and the idea of a " dead picture " was even worse. Actuated by all these considerations, I put spurs—or rather *heels*, to my horse—for spurs I had none—and galloped off in the most gallant style imaginable. Looking around, in a short time I perceived my pursuer rapidly gaining upon me; I urged my horse to the top of her speed; the horse behind seemed to have reached its maximum velocity. It would have been an intensely interesting question in simple equations to have set down

the speed of my horse at 40 (for she was going precisely like that often quoted and popular number) and the speed of my pursuer's horse at 40 + x, and then to have calculated how long it would have taken his horse to have overtaken mine. But I felt very little inclination for cyphering at the moment, although the quantity of fine sand in the road would have rendered it a charming spot for an ancient mathematician. Onward we went, helter-skelter, up hill and down hill, through lonesome pines, which uttered a dirge-like sigh as I passed along, and every few minutes through a lumbering gate which I always tried to shut after me as tightly and securely as possible. At last I came to a famous gate. It closed in the middle of a deep mud puddle. Fortunately, it was slightly open when I reached it, so that I had very little difficulty in passing through. But as I am always conscientious about shutting gates, so I particularly attended to that duty upon the present occasion. What was my delight to perceive that the gate when closed could not possibly be opened by a person upon horseback, and with great difficulty, at any rate. Now was my time to fly; depend upon it, I made the best use of it, and when at last I reached a distant eminence and looked behind, I had the satisfaction of seeing my unrelenting pursuer dismounted from his horse, and still tugging away at the obstinate and faithful gate. I never saw him again, for shortly afterwards I reached the ferry, was pushed across by a stoical colored man, and pursued my way through a *gatey* but still a fertile looking country in the direction of Upper Marlborough. This place I reached about 2 o'clock. This town is very curiously as well as very beautifully situated. It is surrounded in all directions except the Southeast by high hills, and appears to lie in a basin which must formerly have served as a reservoir of water. The idea struck me the moment I cast my eye over the prospect, and what was my surprise to find it verified in a high marl-bank quite close to the town, where the innumerable remains of extinct species of shell fish were distinctly visible. This to me was very curious, as I had never before seen a marl-bank. After a late dinner I shaved, read and wrote until tea-time, after which I visited the Rev[d] Mr. Trapnell,[48] whom I found sitting with his wife, a very pretty

[48] Rev. Joseph Trapnell, Jr., a native of Maryland, in 1844 was rector of Trinity Church, Upper Marlboro.

woman, as plump and as round as a cherry. Trapnell gave me every encouragement and afforded me every facility in making my application among his parishioners. He is a very agreeable man in his conversation, and shows a remarkably fine set of teeth when he laughs. I retired to bed at an early hour.

Friday, March 22. Early in the morning, with the assistance of an excellent chart prepared for me by Mr. Trapnell, I took my circuit among his parishioners. The first person I called on was Mr. Clagett,[49] whose wife, he being unwell, read the Bishop's letter very slowly for her own benefit in the first instance, and then taking it into an adjoining room, reperused it, aloud, at least four times, as different members of the family made their appearance, in succession. During all this time I was left to the refreshing coolness of the parlour where I had first been ushered. But coldness is nothing when attended with profit—as in this case it was, for Mrs. Clagett at length reappeared and presented me with $10.00. Her husband is said to be very wealthy. They live in a good house, well situated, with many indications of plainness and rusticity; together with some few, very few efforts at style. From this place I rode over to Mr. Sasscer's, whom, absent when I first called, I met as I was riding away. Instead of telling him my business in the road, as I might easily have done, I thought it more politic to accept his invitation and ride home with him, where, before a warm fire, the rudy glow of benevolence might descend from his cheeks into his heart. It seems that I judged rightly in some measure, for, saying that he was somewhat conscientious about the matter himself, he nevertheless insisted upon his wife's giving me $5.00. I acted upon the maxim of not looking " the gift horse in the mouth " and to this day Mr. Sasscer's scruples remain to me a matter of interesting and inscrutible perplexity. I then called at the houses of Mr. Chew and his nephew,[50] who live near each other. They were both absent. Mr. Hodkins,[51] whom I next called upon, although unwilling to contribute anything himself, notwithstanding his perfect ability

[49] Thomas Clagett, of " Weston," 6th Thomas in direct line from the emigrant. His 2nd wife was Adeline, daughter of Dr. Thomas Ramsey Hodges, and widow of Dr. Benjamin Mundell. They were married Nov. 13, 1838.

[50] Philemon Chew, son of Maj. Richard Chew and of his 2nd wife Frances (Holland) Chew. The nephew was Leonard Hollyday Chew.

[51] " Mr. Hodkins," was probably Thomas Hodgkins who married Lucy Brooke, daughter of Col. Thomas Brooke.

to do so, yet took the liveliest interest in helping me to find the elder Mr. Chew, upon whose generosity he seemed to place a much higher reliance than upon his own. This interesting feature in Mr. Hodkins' character—his entire distrust of his own good qualities, and his entire reliance upon those of his neighbors—is worthy of notice and may be held up as an instructive example. In the absence of her husband, Mrs. Chew invited me to dine with her. Mrs. Baker [Brooke?] and Miss Brookes were invited guests. The dinner was good, my hostess kind, and the ladies affable. I spent consequently an agreeable time. On my leaving her, Mrs. Chew told me that if her husband would not contribute something towards the building of our church, she would. The Chew house is handsomely situated upon an eminence commanding an extensive prospect of the distant Patuxent and a large tract of intervening country. They appear to live pretty much in our own style—which I take it, is neither too plain nor too elegant for comfort. From this place I returned to Upper Marlborough, and among the citizens first called upon the portly, sonorous and wealthy Mr. Scott.[52] This gentleman flew into a violent passion as soon as he read the Bishop's letter, and stated that he never would contribute a single cent to the erection of any church, until he knew what trumpet was to be blown in it. I might have told him that I should have been blowing a very brazen one myself, if I undertook to inform him of any of those secrets which belong exclusively to futurity; but I curbed this witty sally, because it would not in any way have corresponded with the tirade of balderdash Mr. Scott thought proper to inflict upon me. I made no reply, and seeking Mr. Beale [53] and finding him and nothing else, next directed my steps to another quarter of the town. Mr. Pratt gave me $10.00 in the twinkling of an eye; this gentleman is spoken of as the most prominent candidate for the next Gubernatorial vacancy.[54] If I can do so consistently, I'll patronize Pratt.

[52] Horatio Scott who married Henrietta Maria Waring, daughter of Col. Henry Waring of "Mount Pleasant."

[53] Capt. George Beale, who married the widow of Capt. Eversfield Bowie. He was grandfather of Truxton Beale and Gen. Edward F. Beale.

[54] Gov. Thomas George Pratt (1804-1869), was born in Georgetown, D. C., a descendant of Thomas Pratt of Prince George's Co. and his wife Eleanor Magruder. He practised law in Upper Marlboro, was elected Governor in 1844 and U. S. Senator in 1849. An ardent secessionist, he was confined in Fortress Monroe. His wife was Adelaide, daughter of Gov. Joseph Kent.

With lawyer Tuck's [55] subscription of $5.00 my labors of the day came to a termination, though I did myself the pleasure to attend a lecture at Mr. Trapnell's house at night. As a number of people were present, and the room was very close, with a hot coal fire in it, I was compelled to give many nods of approbation before the lecture concluded, which, as I did not wish to flatter Mr. Trapnell unnecessarily, I hope he did not perceive. I went to bed at an early hour, and slept like a top until

Saturday, March 23, when, after breakfasting and Trapnellizing, I set out in pursuit of Mr. Mackenheimer's,[56] intending however to call upon certain persons by the way. Mr. Hilliary, to whose house I first went, gave me the agreeable spectacle of a long beard and an excellent hand writing; he subscribed five dollars, with a promise to pay at some future period. Thence, I rode to Mr. John Hodges, who exhibited before me three or four of the prettiest children I had ever seen; I patted and praised them all, and in return received a note for $5.00. This gentleman's appearance pleased me very much; he deserves the handsome place and handsome style in which he lives, for he appears to be in the highest degree amiable, generous and hospitable. But, if pleased with John, much more was I captivated by Benjamin Hodges.[57] The only man I had met with since leaving home whom I yearned to make my bosom friend was Benjamin Hodges. He lives in a small but neat house on the very summit of a lofty hill; in the same way as his heart, which appears to be the abode of all the domestic virtues, towers above the generality of its kind. At this place I dined, and should have been glad to have supped, bedded and breakfasted there, had not the prospect of Washington and the delights there to be experienced admonished me to proceed. Mrs. Hodges appears to have a spirit congenial with her husband; and old Mrs. Hodges, the mother,

[55] Wm. Hallam Tuck (1808-1884), married Margaret Sprigg Bowie Chew. Member of the House of Delegates, later of the Maryland Senate, member of the Constitutional Convention of 1851, he became judge of the Court of Appeals in 1852 and later was a Circuit Judge.

[56] Rev. George Lindenberger Machenheimer, a native of Baltimore, in 1844 was rector of Queen Anne's Parish, embracing St. Barnabas' Church and Henderson Chapel. The latter was created a separate parish as Holy Trinity later in the year 1844. The church is at the present Collington. St. Barnabas' was and is one of the finest old church buildings in the State.

[57] John and Benjamin Hodges were sons of John Hodges of Upper Marlboro and his wife Rebecca Berry.

although she wheezes most distressingly, may, for aught I know, be as estimable as either of them. The country passed through during my afternoon's ride appeared to be very fertile, and must in summer be very beautiful; it is called the forest of Prince George's.[58] There seems to be no intermediate class between the slave and the extensive landholder. The fields appear to be immensely large; and the road, without a fence upon either side, winds its way through the midst of them. Every half mile there is a gate, and every now and then appears a stately residence. I generally made it a point to inquire the name of the owners, and the replies induced me to believe that a large part of the country is settled by the Bowie family. I met with but two white persons during a ride of at least fourteen miles, and those two, riding together, I encountered just in time to prevent my losing my way. Mr. Mackenheimer's house is situated about 50 yards from a very neat little chapel, which is about 10 miles distant from the parish church, which venerable building I had passed shortly after leaving Mr. Hodges's. The situation of both house and chapel is very beautiful and some care seems to have been devoted to their decoration. The pastor received me hospitably in the first instance; but *most* hospitably when he ascertained my object and euphonious appellation. As he himself rejoices in a long, sonorous name (George Lindenberger Mackenheimer) he seems to have a particular fancy for measuring patronymics with every long-telled son of Adam he encounters; and as he is usually victorious in all such engagements, it seems to preserve his mind in a state of the most philanthropic good humour. I am only left to conjecture what would be the acerbity of his feelings in meeting with such men as Hononchrotonthologos or Aldiborontifoscophornio. As, however, after a tight spell of it, he beat me by at least three letters, he seemed to be overpowered with joyful emotion, and I verily believe I shall retain him as a friend through life. But, besides the length of our names, we found a new bond of attachment in a connection by marriage with our families. The moment this connection was discovered, although I had for some time been conversing with Mr. Mackenheimer upon terms of the most intimate acquaintanceship, the good pastor commenced a formal

[58] In colonial times "the forest" meant country away from tidewater. After that came "the back country." These terms were used in both Maryland and Virginia.

introduction of me to his family—saying, Mrs. Mackenheimer, Mr. V. B.—Miss Willard, Mr. V. B.—children, Mr. V. B. Miss Willard, the governess, a New England lady, was very delicate in her appearance; Mrs. Mackenheimer, on the contrary, was very portly and robust, and *children* (for I had thus been introduced to them) were, like all others in the world, various in their beauty and qualifications. "We talked of virtue till the time of bed;" and if there be any virtue in sleep, I spent the night certainly to great advantage.

Sunday, March 24. The sun shone brightly, but the air was piercing cold, as, during the forenoon Mr. Mackenheimer's large and fashionable looking congregation assembled at the chapel. On either side of the building there was a row of handsome equipages, and fine looking riding horses were fastened in every direction around the Chapel yard. The interior presented more the aspect of a city gathering, than a congregation from the bosom of a forest. The serman was first-rate; *read* to be sure, but read in first-rate style. It was upon the subject of liberality in behalf of charitable purposes, and where it was at all necessary, cut directly to the quick. I have seldom been better pleased. Before service, Mr. Tyler,[59] learning by accident the nature of my mission, voluntarily gave me $5.00. During the afternoon, I spent a very pleasant time in conversation with Mr. Mackenheimer and his family, that gentleman being exceedingly pleasant and talkative, and his family in the highest degree kind and hospitable. He read me a short journal of his giving an account of a visit to Cape May during the last summer, and I, in return, read him some extracts from my journal, with which he was pleased to express himself quite gratified.

Monday, March 25. After breakfast, I rode over to the residence of Senator Bowie,[60] but not finding him at home, returned to the parsonage, and shortly after, in company with Mr. Mackenheimer set out for Washington. We passed through a poor and uninteresting tract of country, and arrived about three o'clock greatly fatigued by reason of the unusual warmth of the weather.

[59] Grafton Tyler, M. D., who married Mary Margaret, daughter of Walter Bowie, Jr., of "Locust Grove," Prince George's Co. Dr. Tyler was from Frederick, Md,. but settled in Georgetown, D. C.

[60] Col. William Duckett Bowie, State Senator, of "Fairview," father of Gov. Oden Bowie by his first wife, Mary Eliza Oden.

The parson and I repaired immediately to an oyster cellar, where we were provided with a plentiful meal and a good glass of wine. I spent the afternoon chiefly in strolling about and lounging in bookstores. There was need of something soothing to calm the multitude of ideas which agitated my mind. At length I took a cup of strong tea, but thinking that scarcely sufficient, I fortified it with a cup of coffee. Thus primed, I strolled by moonlight in the direction of the President's house, and, with the aid of numerous directions, found my way at length in front of the small but neat and quiet residence of Mrs. Evileth. After rapping for some time, a colored girl appeared and answered, in reply to my inquiry, that Miss Kate [61] was at home, but confined by sickness to her bed. Surprise and sorrow took possession of me for a few moments—when, sending up my card, I turned dejectedly away. Scarcely had I gone fifty yards from the door, when the maid came running after me to tell me that Miss Kate expected to be up tomorrow, and hoped that I would then call upon her. Such was my joy at receiving this intelligence, that, colored as she was, I could have turned around and given her a hearty kiss. It being Lent, however, I abstained, and after a tedious walk, solicited and obtained a long and private interview with " tired Nature's sweet restorer."

Tuesday, March 26. After breakfast, Mr. Mackenheimer accompanied me on a visit to the rector of Trinity parish, the Rev. Mr. Stringfellow,[62] and after measuring names with him, and finding that they were exactly even, stated concisely the nature of his errand and left the house as speedily as possible. It is impossible to convey any idea in words of Mr. Mackenheimer's peculiarities of manner. Nothing but mimickry of a high order could convey any impression of his numerous little oddities and excentricities. I take him to be a very amiable man, of great simplicity of heart and character. He strongly reminds me of his own uncle, Jacob Lindenberger, who was also my uncle, by marriage. Expression of countenance, tone of voice, peculiarity of manner, bent of mind and disposition—everything, in a word, recalls to my mind the recollection of my deceased uncle, whom in childhood I was so

[61] Daughter of James Eveleth, of the Office of U. S. Engineers. The family lived at this time on G St., N. W., between 18th and 19th Sts.

[62] Rev. Horace Stringfellow, of Virginia, rector of Trinity Church, Washington, from 1839 to 1847.

fond of, but who died when the parson was much too young to be capable of imitating him—a fact, which proves that manners, habits and disposition are in a great measure innate, and not the result of education. Mr. Stringfellow, although excessively cold in his manners, was nevertheless generous in his actions. He gave me a long list of the wealthiest of his parishioners, and a letter of introduction to the Revd Mr. Hawley. Between 12 and 1 o'clock I called upon Miss Kate—the incomparable Kate Eveleth! and found her the more interesting, perhaps, by reason of her hoarseness and debility, the effects, of her late indisposition—a severe attack of croup. Oh, Heaven's! how graciously she received me! Ah me! how poorly my own behaviour responded to the reception! But, I could not help it. Had I been a total stranger, among none other but total strangers, I could have been at ease. I could have been merry, perhaps happy. But to meet for the first time with Kate, whom I knew so well, for whom I entertain so sincere a friendship, in the midst of a crowd of people not only strangers, but absolutely disagreeable to me (the Pottses, the Grahams and the Crawfords), produced a revulsion of feelings from which during the whole time of my stay in Washington, I was never enabled to recover. For this foolish weakness (a weakness alike foolish and unconquerable) I was punished by observing in Kate a total want of that jovial cordiality which formerly subsisted between us, and a gradually increasing reserve which only tended to augment the embarrassment of my position. I subsided at length into a fixed solemnity of deportment, the rigidity of which it would have been difficult even for Punch or Harlequin to relax. I can have but a very faint conception of the impression which my deportment must have produced. Conceive of a man naturally disagreeable, endeavoring to heighten the dispensations of nature by a frightful length of visage, and a dogged sullenness of demeanor. The result must undoubtedly have been the exhibition of all that is most intolerable in the social state. Notwithstanding this, my stay in Washington was anything but disagreeable, indeed there was a pleasure attending it, which, considering the circumstances just alluded to, it is difficult to explain, almost impossible to conceive of. There was a magic influence of some kind which forced me to linger there from day to day—and infused a species of transport into

what must have appeared to others a state of misery. But enough of this! Mrs. Maynadier most hospitably insisted upon a removal of my baggage to her house that very evening. Here, I was provided with every comfort, and treated with a warmth of hospitality I had never before experienced. Never shall I forget the kindness experienced under the roof of Capt. and Mrs. Maynadier. Alas! How shabbily did I respond to it! Without retaining any longer the journal form, I will group together the principal incidents of my visit to Washington, and hasten home as rapidly as possible. [End of Ms. At the back of the book are the following:]

[Estimated Collections for Westminster Church Building]

Subscription list,	$ 620.	
Money in bank,	292.	
Baltimore collections,	90.	
Travelling collections,	246.	
Mr. Raymond,	50.	
Lectures,	16.	
	$1314.	
Expectations traveling,	50.	Expectations
Frederick,	200.	
Baltimore and elsewhere,	436.	
	$2000.	

[Account of Expenses]

March 6	Fourman	5.00
"	Cars	1.25
"	Carrying valise	.12½
"	Silliman's lecture & Man Chew	.62½
March 7	Gloves for self & Chew	2.00
"	Saddle bags, bridle, martingale & spur	6.00
"	Books, blanket	.50
"	T.i.L.	1.87½
March 8	Comb & brush	1.00
"	Umbrella	1.50
Mar. 8.9	Dinner, Supper, lodging, breakfast & servant	2.00
	Cars to Sykesville	1.25
	Bill at Sykesville for horse & self	2.00
	Sundries	.25

March 11.	Dinner & horsefeed, between Sykesville & W. Harrison's	.50
	Oysters & sundries at Elli. Mills	.50
	Servant at Hugh Harrisons	.20
		27.57½
March 12-14	at Ellicotts Mills	4.00
	Servants	.25
	Passage on Cars from relay house to Anappolis	1.00
	Horse at relay house, one night	.50
	Dinner, horse & servant on road	.50
	Gates & cakes	.25
March 15	Boy for bringing horse from relay house to Annapolis	1.75

BOOK REVIEWS

Ranger Mosby. By VIRGIL CARRINGTON JONES. Raleigh: University of North Carolina Press, 1944. 347 pp. $3.50.

Today we read much of guerilla fighting, underground organization and partisan warfare, activities which are recognized as important insurance for ultimate victories against aggressive enemies. It is difficult to realize that not long ago the value of such activity was questioned since the science of military tactics had no place for it in its manuals. Such was the case in the fighting of 1861-1865.

Outlining early guerilla warfare during this period and contrasting our current impression of the personalities of such fighters, this new book on Colonel John S. Mosby, the dashing Southern leader of organized partisan activity against Hooker, Meade, Sheridan and Grant, reveals him as a most successful tactician of such fighting, and a singularly well-educated man who " could lead his men into the jaws of death one moment and talk of birds and books and poetry the next." Wearing his plumed hat and flowing, red-lined cape, he directed mounted " strike—disrupt—retire " tactics paralleling Commando and Ranger activities of current days. The Virginian was far ahead of his time in using his troopers for scouting and pestering, designed always to upset and delay the enemy's plans. With all this dash and color, catalysed by his commander, General J. E. B. Stuart, Mosby remained a calm thinker who based all of his decisions on his analysis of the facts at hand; this was characterized by his active support of General Ulysses S. Grant for President during the post-war political campaigning of 1867 against strong Southern opposition.

Mosby's military judgment was held in high esteem by Lee, and many of the Northern reports are interwoven with praise of the raider's prowess in disrupting their lines.

It is interesting to note that while the armies of Lee and Johnston were suffering from lack of supplies and replacements weeks before Appomattox, Mosby's command had risen at that time to its greatest strength in efficiency and numbers. This was due largely to the absorption of trained cavalrymen from broken commands, and the attraction of informal discipline under which the Partisan Rangers operated.

The author has delved into a large amount of available source material to fill in the outline formulated at wintry sessions around the hot stove of the Gordonsville store and around the banquet tables at Confederate reunions. His substantiation of many incidents cements them to the structure of the past as factual data. By attempting a fictionalized introduction

through the first chapter, some uncertainty is encountered; this can be forgotten if the reader succeeds in bridging this shakiness to reach the solid ground of facts in succeeding chapters.

During recent years a number of scholarly studies on figures and phases of the Civil War have come forth to replace many of the biased, less accurate volumes, published largely during the "cooling" period after the heat of battle had subsided. This factual, yet colorfully interesting picture of Mosby will receive hearty welcome from students of military tactics and personalities.

EDWARD M. STRAUSS, JR.

The Development of the Colonial Newspaper. By SIDNEY KOBRE. Pittsburgh: the author, 1944. 188 pp.

This slender volume is an excellent introduction to the subject it ably handles. It contains a well-rounded synthesis of the origin and development of the colonial newspaper, illustrating thereby the political economic and cultural growth of early America, of the fight for freedom of the press, and of the newspaper's part in the building-up of colonial solidarity This book also stresses the inter-relationship of these various forces as they weave an American pattern.

Mr. Kobre has managed to let each newspaper speak for itself: all the newspapers from 1690 to 1783 are presented, while all the important ones are examined in some detail. The liberal use of well-chosen quotations serves to bind the story together into a readable and refreshing work.

Accounts of the colonial newspaper are found in the general works of Mott, Bleyer and Lee, with Lawrence Wroth's specializations in the colonial field. Mr. Kobre's book is a welcome addition to the colonial newspaper and serves as a satisfactory introduction to that important and productive field in the history of American life and thought. It is a serious attempt to explain the newspaper and is not a mere compilation of facts.

Of particular interest to Maryland readers, is the liberal amount of space devoted to the *Maryland Gazette* and the *Maryland Journal*. The picture of Maryland life and culture in chapter VIII is well worth reading. While the story of Peter Zenger is properly recorded, great emphasis is placed on the importance of William Goddard as an exponent of a free press, in that editor's fight with the Whig Club of Baltimore. Here was not popular opposition to a royal governor but the uphill fight of a courageous and independent editor against Baltimore patriots.

This book contains a table of contents, a bibliography, and a series of valuable charts and tables illustrating newspaper growth, population growth and export-import growth. Unfortunately there is no index. It is hard to understand how such an important feature of scholarly work could be omitted.

JOHN J. TIERNEY, S. S.

St. Charles College, Catonsville, Md.

A Life of Travels. By C[ONSTANTINE] S[AMUEL] RAFINESQUE. (Chronica Botanica, Vol. 8, Number 2.) [Waltham, Mass.: Chronica Botanica Co., 1944.]. [291-]360 pp. $2.50.

This monograph presents an account of his voyages and travels—mostly in Sicily and in the United States—by the well-known botanist, ichthyologist and archaeologist, C. S. Rafinesque. Like many another remarkable man, this one was of mixed origin, the son of a Frenchman, who married a citizen of Greece, a woman of German extraction née Schmaltz. The mother's unlovely name stood him in good stead when in Sicily, for he added it to his own, so he tells us, in order to pass as an American, which, for some reason or other, was in the interest of safety. This reprint of the 1836 edition is accompanied by an interesting introduction by Dr. E. D. Merrill, of the Arnold Arboretum, in which a somewhat higher estimate is accorded to Rafinesque's work as a botanist, than that which, it appears, has been hitherto conceded by persons competent to hold an opinion on that subject. But whatever his standing as a scientist may be, or should be, Rafinesque was certainly an extraordinary, and in some respects, admirable, man. Sicily seems to have been the land of his choice, although to him it was an isle " where every prospect pleases and only man is vile." He makes exception of certain kindly Sicilian scientists, who took an interest in his work (personal magnetism must have been one of his assets in life, for, wherever he went, he never lacked assistance) ; and he gives credit to the bandits for seldom, if ever, robbing one who carried little money on him and went unarmed.

In the United States Rafinesque travelled hundreds of miles through forests and over mountains in quest of rare plants, generally and by preference afoot, for, as he truly says, one can not conveniently dismount from a horse every now and then in order to examine a flower. He travelled mostly alone, had little money on his person and was probably not infrequently unarmed. Apparently, he had not the slightest fear of loneliness, of lawless men or of wild beasts. He did not, to be sure, penetrate very far to the West—no farther than what is now the state of Tennessee; but he wanted to join Lewis and Clark's Expedition, an ambition in which he was disappointed. Wherever he went Rafinesque sought out men of distinction, who were likely to be interested in his work. He enjoyed a great deal of hospitality, for which, no doubt, his hosts felt themselves well repaid. The present work is illustrated with two likenesses of Rafinesque and enlivened with drawings by himself of two of his " belles amies de Kentucky," both unidentified, one Juliet, to whom he dedicated some verses, the other without a name, but of whom he says: " Elle était séduisante, Belle aimable et charmante." This seductive Blue Grass belle appears against a background representing a tropical landscape, including a volcano in eruption (Mount Etna?). This reminds us of a travelling opera troupe which gave a performance of *Lucia di Lammermoor* in a certain city in Georgia. The night before they had given *Aïda.* One of

the scenes in "Lucia" called for a background of the Scottish highlands; but instead of that the astonished audience saw the River Nile and the Pyramids!

WILLIAM B. MARYE.

The English Geographers and the Anglo-American Frontier in the Seventeenth Century. By FULMER MOOD. (University of California Publications in Geography, Volume 6, No. 9, pp. 363-396.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1944. [33 pp.] 35 cents.

This interesting essay discusses the part played by the seventeenth century English geographers in the colonization of America. The first part provides a chronological account of the works of those writers, considered in four classes: handbooks of general or world geography, purely American geographical works, volumes devoted exclusively to the English settlements, and books dealing with single areas or colonies. The conclusion is that, for the most part, the geographers did not produce works of merit.

The first good book—George Gardner's *Description of the New World or America*—appeared in 1651, almost half a century after the beginning of colonial activity. It was twenty years before the publication of another first-rate work, John Ogilby's *America* (1671). The general run of writers slapped together what data they could find, appropriated portions of previous books, and turned out musty tomes which lacked the freshness of personal knowledge, smelled of the closet, and were invariably inaccurate. It is interesting to note that Maryland received only slight attention from anyone; New England, Virginia, and the island colonies—especially the last—dominated the scene.

The second section of the essay surveys the attitude of the geographical writers toward colonization, and demonstrates "the intimate connection that existed between the business forces that promoted expansion on the one hand, and the literary advocates who supported and justified this expansionist movement on the other.' It is shown that, from the earliest times, the geographers allied themselves with the economic interests, aiding the promoters of settlements with favorable descriptions, generous comment, and even active partisanship. Several writers, indeed, grasped the possibilities of a farflung English empire long before the merchants and the diplomatists were aware of them. The final impression is, therefore, that the geographers were more effective as promoters than as observers and chroniclers.

This compact summary is a valuable contribution to colonization literature.

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

American Historical Societies, 1790–1860. By LESLIE W. DUNLAP. Madison, Wis.: the Author, 1943. 238 pp. $3.50.

The 65 societies which had been founded by 1860 are here presented in a synthesis comprising the early history of the movement to collect the materials of American history and to make them known. Not all of this number survived; many were local to small communities and enjoyed brief careers.

The author shows the motives which actuated the founders, the leadership, largely individual, which gave the successful ones their vitality and the trends in development and activities. This general picture is supported by a thumbnail sketch of each of the 65 societies. The Maryland Historical Society attracts notice by several unusual features, not all of which have been retained; for instance, provision for county chapters, formation of a gallery of fine arts other than historical, and efforts to make its rooms a social "resort." It appears that this Society was twelfth in order of founding of those organizations now extant which bear state names. That of Massachusetts led in 1791. Then came New York 1804, Rhode Island and Maine 1822, New Hampshire 1823, Pennsylvania 1824, Connecticut 1825, Virginia 1831, Kentucky 1838, Georgia 1839, Vermont 1840 and Maryland 1844.

J. W. F.

This Is Carlisle: A History of a Pennsylvania Town. By MILTON EMBICK FLOWER and LENORE EMBICK FLOWER. [Carlisle: the Authors, 1944.] 72 pp. $2.00.

This sketch of a town which is Maryland's neighbor wears a fresh and inviting aspect. From the founding of Carlisle in 1750 to the present War, the development of the community is outlined with accompanying biographical data on the leading worthies. It is surprising to see the number of men of renown who figured in the town's history—Bouquet, Forbes, André, James Wilson, Armstrong, Molly Pitcher, Commodore Elliott, Brackenridge and others who lived in Carlisle for short or long periods.

The town's physical development, its remaining examples of fine architecture, its schools, churches and clubs receive appropriate notice. Well illustrated, well organized and well written, this little book should spur other communities to emulation in history writing.

J. W. F.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

The Sullivan Expedition of 1779. Contemporary Newspaper Comment and Letters. By ALBERT HAZEN WRIGHT. [Cornell University] (Studies in History, Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8.) Ithaca: the Author, 1943. 53, 50, 34, 9 pp. Gift of author.

Missouri—Day by Day. By FLOYD C. SHOEMAKER. Columbia, Mo.: State Historical Society, 1943. 499 pp. Gift of Society.

Karen Long, Medical Technician. By MARY ELLIS TURNER. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1943. 211 pp. Gift.
The story of a volunteer in one of the laboratories of Johns Hopkins Hospital by a Batimore instructor in the Hopkins Medical School.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Bon Secours Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland, 1919-1944. [Baltimore: the Hospital, 1944.] 56 pp. Gift of Mother Superior.

70 Years of St. Matthews Parish, Garrett County, Md., 1870-1940. By THEKLA FUNDENBERG WEEKS. [Oakland, Md.: the Author, no date.] 52 pp. Gift of the author.

NOTES AND QUERIES

A LAWYER'S ADVICE TO A LAWYER SON

A letter written by Henry Hollyday (1771-1850) of "Ratcliffe Manor," Talbot County, to his son Richard C. Hollyday (1810-1885) then settling in Cumberland to practise law, has kindly been transcribed for use in the *Magazine* by Mr. Frederic Hollyday of "Kingshaven," St. Michaels', a member of the Society. The original is owned by the heirs of Col. Henry Hollyday of "St. Aubins," Easton. The writer was born at "Ratcliffe Manor," graduated at Princeton, married Ann, daughter of Richard Bennett and Ann Murray Carmichael of Queen Anne's County, served in the Maryland Senate and as judge of the Levy Court. The younger Hollyday later moved to Elkton, served as clerk of court, as a member of the House of Delegates, and as secretary of state under six governors.

Ratcliffe, Augst. 20th 1834

"My Dear Richard

Altho I have not written to you since your settlement at Cumberland yet I have never ceased to feel great anxiety & deep concern on your account. It is by no means to be expected that you would get employment in your profession immediately, but this leizure may be turned to advantage, as it will afford you an opportunity of gaining a better knowledge of your profession by study, or improving yourself in general literature. I would not have you despair of obtaining business where you are at present located. You ought by no means to feel discouraged at small difficulties, but remember by unremitting industry, & perseverance, men seldom fail of success in any profession. I cannot omit to offer on occasion a few other suggestions, which I think may be useful to you in after life & to which I trust you will give that attention the importance of the

subject requires. In transactions of business entrusted to your management always observe *diligence, fidelity & dispatch.* I have known men who have neither talents, nor knowledge of the law—by diligently *collecting, faithfully,* & speedily paying of claims gain very extensive practice. I need scarcely remark that nothing should ever induce you to make use of your clients money. My Uncle James Hollyday stood as high for sound judgment, & extensive knowledge of the law as most men of his day. But he was *preeminent* as a man of *integrity* & *fidelity.* One of his maxims as I have heard was never to support an unjust cause. This I acknowledge would frequently be a difficult point to determine but cases might often occur when the injustice might be palpable. Another rule of conduct (which applies more to political than professional life) was never to *support* a *party* further than his conscience & judgment approved. This rule I most earnestly recommend for adoption as calculated to secure not only your own approbation but also the approval of all wise & good men. I trust there is no occasion to caution you against forming associations calculated to lead into immoralities or dissipations, as your own good sense, moral habits, & experience in life, will sufficiently guard you. . . . It is now . . . to remit you $50 or 100 if necessary. You can let me know [how] much & when you will want it. We are all tolerably well & unite in affect remembrances & best wishes for yr. success. I remain yr. affect. Father

Hy. Hollyday

Boteler—Who was the father of Walter Boteler (October 22, 1763-August 22, 1829)? He married Jemima Davis on December 15, 1785. Please cite proof.

Reply to Editor, *Maryland Historical Magazine.*

Summers—Wanted: Maiden name of Mary —— Summers, wife of John Summers (who died 1769, Prince George's Co., Md.). She was probably born about 1704 and is thought to have been Mary Moore (daughter of James, Sr.). Should like proof and list of sisters and brothers.

Beulah J. Johnson,
625 Huckins Hotel, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Wells—Can any one give any data about Thomas Wells of Calvert Co., Md., an early Maryland settler who removed to Albemarle Co., Virginia before 1779? Would like to correspond with someone of that descent.

Mrs. Anna M. Halsey,
2306 Happy Hollow Blvd., Omaha, Nebr.

Rouse, Busey, Philpot.—Wish information regarding members of these families who were in military or naval service during the Revolution, particularly the line of James Rouse, born July 1, 1799, in Ohio, of Maryland ancestry. His wife was Edith Busey, born Nov. 18, 1802, in Kentucky. Also data on Matthew Bussey or Busey, born April 9, 1742, who married Edith Philpot (born in Md. 1740), widow of —— Wilcoxen.

Miss EMMA M. ROUSE,
625 Jackson St., Anoka, Minn.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

RALPH ROBINSON is a former president of the Baltimore Bar Association. He contributed an article on the treatment of prisoners in the War of 1812 to the *American Historical Review* for October, 1943, and to the *Maryland Historical Magazine* for September, 1942, on fresh findings concerning the British in Maryland in 1814. ☆ DR. WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR., a frequent contributor to the *Magazine,* needs no introduction ☆ DR. FRANK B. JEWETT, vice-president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and chief of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, spared time from his busy days to indulge, largely for the benefit of the Society, in a retrospective view of the significance of Morse's invention. ☆ Formerly corresponding secretary of the Society, J. ALEXIS SHRIVER is a leading authority on events in Maryland past and present and the author of nearly all the road markers of the State which afford so much pleasure to history-minded wayfarers.

Volume XXXIX Number 4

The Maryland Historical Magazine

1844 1944

DECEMBER · 1944

William Pinkney's First Public Service . *Max P. Allen* 277
Civilian Defense in Baltimore, 1814-1815 (*continued*)
Edited by *William D. Hoyt, Jr.* 293
Early Maryland Bookplates . *Edith R. Bevan* 310
Politics in Maryland during the Civil War
(*continued*) . . . *Charles B. Clark* 315
Governor Charles Goldsborough's Views on Slavery 332
Among the "Meeters at the Bayside"
Emerson B. Roberts 335
Book Reviews 345
Notes and Queries 357

Published Quarterly by the
MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
BALTIMORE

$3.00 the Year Single copy 75 c.

Publications of the

Maryland Historical Society

For sale at prices shown.

First Commander of Kent Island, by Sebastian F. Streeter	$1.25
Brief Account of the Settlement of Ellicott's Mills, with Fragments of History Therewith Connected, by Martha E. Tyson	1.50
The First Steamboat Voyage on the Western Waters, by J. H. B. Latrobe	1.00
Narrative of a Voyage to Maryland, by Father Andrew White, S. J.; with Extracts from Different Letters of Missionaries, 1638-1677. Edited by Rev. E. A. Dalrymple, S. T. D.	2.25
Wenlock Christison and the Early Friends in Talbot County, Md., by Samuel A. Harrison	1.00
Capt. Richard Ingle, the Maryland "Pirate and Rebel," 1642-1653, by Edward Ingle	1.00
Maryland in Liberia: History of the Colony Planted by Maryland State Colonization Society under Auspices of State of Maryland, 1833-1853, by J. H. B. Latrobe	2.25
A Memoir of John Leeds Bozman, the First Historian of Maryland, by Samuel A. Harrison	1.25
Rev. Thomas Bray: His Life and Selected Works relating to Maryland. Edited by Bernard C. Steiner	3.00

All in paper covers.

Address orders to the

SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY,

201 W. Monument Street, Baltimore 1, Maryland

GENEALOGICAL CHARTS



Denby Chart Blanks—A blank form for listing ancestry

Sizes and Prices

Chart		each
16" x 32"	@	$1.00
28" x 44"	@	1.50
28" x 44"	@	2.25
28" x 44"	@	3.50
27" x 40"	@	4.00

Broadside *"America"* in Denby Type
25" x 34" $3.00 each

BOOKS

LINCOLNIANA
The Publication of the Year
Various Display Prints in Denby Types—Synopsis Charts
Memorial Charts: Washington, Lincoln
School Edition ..... $2.75 each
Special Edition ..... 3.50 each
DeLuxe Edition ..... 4.50 each

CATALOG NO. 3 OF DENBY TYPES
Contains, besides data on Type, Two Synopsis charts, The Denby and Hooper Achievements and the Large chart filled for Denby Genealogy
20 Crests from Denby pedigrees
Price: (paper cover) $4.00 each

VICTOR HUGO
FRANCE and Present Day Events
Poems and Translations
Price: in scroll form $3.00
Bound 10" x 19" 5.00

WATER COLOR CATALOG
And Two Supplements
Price: (paper cover) $ 3.00 each copy
3 copies bound 10.00 together

THE COQ D'OR PRESS, 333 FOURTH AVE., NEW YORK 10

MOVING AND STORAGE

Sixty-three Years of Service to Baltimore

MONUMENTAL

STORAGE AND CARPET CLEANING CO.

SPECIAL VAULTS FOR ART OBJECTS AND SILVER: MOVING, PACKING, SHIPPING, FUMIGATING, RUG CLEANING, REPAIRING, LAYING

1110-1116 PARK AVENUE BALTIMORE, MD.

TELEPHONE SARATOGA 3480

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Buildings
201 W. MONUMENT STREET
BALTIMORE 1

OFFICERS: *President,* George L. Radcliffe; *Vice-Presidents,* J. Hall Pleasants, Laurence Hall Fowler, J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul; *Corresponding Secretary,* William B. Marye; *Recording Secretary,* W. Hall Harris, Jr.; *Treasurer,* Heyward E. Boyce; *Director,* James W. Foster.

THE COUNCIL: The General Officers and Representatives of standing committees—*Trustees of the Athenaeum,* G. Corner Fenhagen; *Publications,* Raphael Semmes; *Library,* L. H. Dielman; *Finance,* Charles E. Rieman; *Membership,* Mrs. Francis F. Beirne; *Addresses,* B. Howell Griswold, Jr.; *Gallery,* John H. Scarff.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION: *Chairman,* Raphael Semmes; J. Hall Pleasants; *Editor,* James W. Foster.

The Maryland Historical Society, incorporated in 1844, has been engaged in collecting, preserving and disseminating information relating to the history of the State. Through its services to scholars and others in making available collections of research materials, and through its publications, the Society has occupied and always should occupy an important place in the cultural life of Maryland.

Since 1906 the Society has published *The Maryland Historical Magazine.* There are monthly meetings from October to May, inclusive, at which addresses of a historical or literary nature are given. Those interested in the objects of the Society are invited to have their names proposed for membership. The annual dues are $5.00, life membership $100.00. Subscription to *The Maryland Historical Magazine* and to the quarterly news bulletin, *Maryland History Notes,* is included in the membership fee of five dollars, as well as the use of the Society's collections and admission to the monthly lectures. The library, portrait gallery and museum rooms, are open on every day of the week except Sundays.

The Society depends on the people of Maryland and its friends elsewhere for its maintenance. The gift of documents and books and donations or bequests to the endowment fund, have made it possible to build up a notable historical library. The collections include not only manuscripts dealing with the social, political and military history of the State, but also letters, diaries, business accounts, maps, newspapers, pamphlets, prints and photographs. Only by a continuance of interest in the Society will it be possible to preserve and catalogue its present collections and, of equal importance, to acquire new documents recording the rich history of the people of Maryland. In short, the usefulness of the Maryland Historical Society depends not only upon the number of its members, but upon their generosity as well.

The Magazine is entered as second class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Maryland, under Act of August 24, 1912.

MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXIX DECEMBER, 1944 No. 4

WILLIAM PINKNEY'S FIRST PUBLIC SERVICE[1]

By MAX P. ALLEN

I. THE PINKNEYS OF ANNAPOLIS

In pre-war days Annapolis may have left relatively little impression on some of the casual June week visitors who were in the city to attend the social and academic functions of the Naval Academy. But in the latter part of the eighteenth century, Maryland's capital, located on the Severn river, compared favorably in size with Baltimore. It was the scene of stirring events which are outstanding in the history of Maryland and the United States.

Here in 1774 a convention adopted resolutions opposing the Intolerable Acts. Here the following year the Association of Freemen of Maryland came into existence. Here independence

[1] Since 1939 the writer has been intermittently engaged in collecting data related primarily to the public career of William Pinkney (1764-1822). In addition to the various sources cited for this article, it seems appropriate to mention certain persons who have been particularly helpful.

Foremost must be listed Mrs. L. Roberts Carton, of Towson, a great-great-granddaughter of Pinkney. She and her husband have many of Pinkney's personal belongings, practically all of the biographical material which has been printed, some letters, and a host of family traditions. Others who have given assistance which has been especially appreciated include the following: Dr. St. George L. Sioussat and Dr. Thomas P. Martin, of the Library of Congress; Dr. P. M. Hamer, of the National Archives; Dr. Morris L. Radoff, Archivist of Maryland; Mr. James W. Foster, Editor of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*; Miss Florence J. Kennedy, of the Maryland Historical Society; and Professor A. L. Kohlmeier, head of the Department of History, Indiana University.

was declared and a state constitution formed. Here after the Revolution General Washington resigned his commission to Congress. Here in 1786, as an aftermath of the meeting at Mt. Vernon the preceding year, assembled the delegates of Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, in a gathering which was the direct forerunner of the Philadelphia Convention. And here lived a family which was destined to furnish Maryland several of its outstanding citizens.

Jonathan Pinkney, born in England about the same year as George Washington, remains as obscure today as progenitors of famous sons often have a habit of doing. His relationship to the Carolina Pinckneys must have been remote, although they may have sprung from some common ancestor who came to England with William the Conqueror. Jonathan emigrated to America, taking residence at Annapolis, "where he lived in quiet seclusion and illustrated the virtues that adorned his character." [2]

His first wife was a Margaret Rind; at her death he married her sister Ann, "a lady of most vigorous understanding and tender sensibilities." By the second marriage Jonathan had four children: a daughter, Nancy, concerning whom little is known, and three sons—Jonathan, Jr., William, and Ninian. One of these sons may have been named for his mother's brother, William Rind, who was a protégé of the Greens in the printing business at Annapolis in the 1760's.[3]

During the years 1769 to 1774, the elder Pinkney paid an annual tax of ten shillings, ten pence on 385 acres of land in Anne Arundel county, 100 acres of which had been purchased from Samuel Chase.[4] Pinkney had just ordered the surveying of 1,125 additional acres when he became involved in the political turmoils which ruined most Tories.[5]

[2] Reverend William Pinkney, *Life of William Pinkney* (New York, 1853), p. 12. The material quoted here and in the following paragraph is typical of this highly eulogistic account written by a nephew who was about twelve years of age at the time of his uncle's death. All the evidence seems to indicate that the uncle was an Episcopalian; the nephew became an Episcopal bishop. Mrs. L. R. Carton to Max P. Allen, Nov. 27, 1943.

[3] Mrs. L. R. Carton to Max P. Allen, Dec. 10, 1943. See also the parish records of the St. Anne's Episcopal Church in Annapolis. For information regarding the Greens, consult Joseph T. Wheeler, *The Maryland Press, 1777-1790* (Baltimore, 1938), pp. 65-70.

[4] Debt Books of Anne Arundel County, 1769-1774, Land Office, Annapolis. Chase still had title to 938 acres upon which the annual tax was thirty-seven shillings, nine pence.

[5] Patent Records of Anne Arundel County, 1774, Land Office, Annapolis. The

In May, 1774, resolutions of sympathy for Boston were adopted at a public meeting in Annapolis, a committee of correspondence being constituted of John Hall, Charles Carroll, Barrister, Thomas Johnson, William Paca, Mathias Hammond, and Samuel Chase.[6] Early the next month a long notice appeared in the *Maryland Gazette* listing 135 people who took this means of expressing disapproval of the revolutionary tendencies in Annapolis. The name of Jonathan Pinkney stood eighth, the foremost being Lloyd Dulany and William Cooke.[7] There was probably not a more outstanding Tory family in America than the Dulanys, the most notable member of which was Daniel, the Younger.[8]

Courage of this type on the part of Jonathan was to characterize his second son, William, born in 1764, who apparently, however, did not share his father's loyalty to the King. The Revolution interrupted his studies at the King William's School, established in 1696 in a plain building located on the south side of the State House.[9] As a later writer has remarked, the records of this school are lost, "but one name remains—that proves its right to existence (it has had more than its share of ups and downs)—William Pinkney's."[10]

Legislative provision was made in 1785 to combine the assets of King William's School and St. John's College.[11] William's

writer was unable to find any mention of Jonathan Pinkney in the Journal of the Proceedings of the Commissioners of the Confiscated British Property. But it is reasonable to accept the verdict of the early biographers that he suffered confiscation along with the more prominent Tories.

[6] *Maryland Gazette* (Annapolis), May 26, 1774. Almost as prominent at this time as Samuel Chase was Jeremiah T. Chase, both being the descendants of a Samuel Chase of London. The latter had two sons who became Anglican clergymen. The Reverend Thomas Chase was the father of Samuel Chase, while the Reverend Richard Chase was the grandfather of Jeremiah T. Chase. Samuel and Jeremiah married sisters, Anne and Hester Baldwin, respectively, of Annapolis. Samuel Chase's son, Thomas, married Jeremiah's daughter, Mathilde, according to the Cary MSS, Maryland Historical Society. Samuel and Jeremiah Chase cooperated most fully in their numerous political enterprises.

[7] *Maryland Gazette*, June 2, 1774.

[8] The latter won the admiration of Pitt and many Americans in 1765 by his *Considerations on the Propriety of Imposing Taxes in the British Colonies for the Purpose of Raising a Revenue by Act of Parliament.* He had lately lost his popularity as a result of a newspaper controversy carried on with Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Consult Richard H. Spencer, "Hon. Daniel Dulany, 1722-1797," in *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XIII (March, 1918), 143-160.

[9] Pinkney, *William Pinkney*, p. 14.

[10] Elihu S. Riley, *The Ancient City. A History of Annapolis, in Maryland* (Annapolis, 1887), p. 80.

[11] *Laws of Maryland*, Nov. Sess., 1785, Ch. XXXIX.

brother Ninian, four years his junior, attended St. John's as did the Reverend William Pinkney, Ninian's son, and many other members of the numerous Pinkney family.[12] William Pinkney "was initiated in classical studies by a private teacher of the name of Brathaud, who took great pains in instructing him, and of whom he always spoke with the warmest affection and gratitude."[13]

The end of the Revolution found Pinkney apprenticed to a doctor in Baltimore whose name is not agreed upon by the early biographers. The young man apparently displayed less interest, however, in medicine than in debating. It was his efforts in the latter field which caught the attention of Samuel Chase.[14] Soon Pinkney gave up the "uncongenial pursuit" of medicine to enter Chase's law office at Annapolis, where he proceeded to exhibit that passion for work which characterized his whole career and doubtless accounted for much of his success.

> In the splendors of Dulany, her [Maryland's] setting luminary (one of the most remarkable men of his age), and in the meridian blaze of her Chase and Martin, who were just then culminating to their zenith, he felt as the sons of genius ever feel, whose steppings are in an illuminated pathway, that those, who would follow in their steps, must give their days and nights to study and emulate their greatness by emulating their love of labor.[15]

[12] Consult Rosamond R. Beirne and Edith R. Bevan, *The Hammond-Harwood House and Its Owners* (Baltimore, 1941) and Orlando Hutton, *Life of the Right Reverend William Pinkney* (Washington, 1890).

On the campus of St. John's College there is a Pinkney Hall, while across the street, next to the Baptist Church, is a Pinkney House. There is some difference of opinion as to the origin of the latter. According to Mrs. Carton, however, it belonged originally to the William Pinkney who is the subject of this article. She estimates that it was moved to the campus about thirty-five or forty years ago. She says that two old ladies, the Misses Pinkney, resided in it up to their deaths and that she often went to visit them with her father, Joseph Whyte. Mrs. L. R. Carton to Max P. Allen, Oct. 5, 1944.

[13] Henry Wheaton, *Some Account of the Life, Writings and Speeches of William Pinkney* (New York, 1826), p. 2. This biography has been the standard source regarding Pinkney ever since it was written. Wheaton spent about three years collecting material and doing the writing. It is quite interesting that Pinkney should have for his first biographer the versatile Wheaton, who became outstanding as a publicist, lawyer, diplomat, and historian.

[14] Robert T. Conrad, ed., *Sanderson's Biography of the Signers to the Declaration of Independence* (Philadelphia, 1848), p. 588. Justice Story agrees with other authorities that Pinkney "acquired his profession with Judge Chase." Consult his "Notes of Lecture on William Pinkney," in William A. Story, ed., *Life and Letters of Joseph Story* (Boston, 1851), p. 490.

[15] Pinkney, *William Pinkney*, p. 16.

Pinkney developed particular attainments in the law of real property and the science of special pleading.

. . . His style of speaking was marked by an easy flow of natural eloquence and a happy choice of language. His voice was very melodious and seemed a most winning accompaniment to his pure and effective diction. His elocution was calm and placid—the very contrast of that strenuous, vehement, and emphatic manner which he subsequently adopted.[16]

Chase's activities as agent for the State of Maryland in its controversy with the Bank of England (just one of the many phases of his life, incidentally, which historians have neglected) led to his making a trip to England in 1783. Presumably he gave his protégé the full benefit of his experiences abroad as well as in American courts, public assemblies, and political gatherings. Chase's predilection for being involved almost constantly in newspaper disputes or lawsuits must have influenced Pinkney to steer clear of such affairs.[17]

At the age of twenty-two, he gained admittance to the bar. He chose Harford County "as the arena of his first professional efforts. She received and rewarded the young adventurer. She saw his worth and appreciated it."[18] Little is known of his experiences during the first part of the six years he lived there. Probably it was at this time that he became acquainted with Ann Maria Rodgers, whom he married in 1789.

[16] Wheaton, *William Pinkney*, p. 6. Mr. William L. Rawls, a Baltimore attorney, has long been interested in the legal aspects of Pinkney's career. The writer is indebted to him for a copy of the address he delivered on Pinkney at Baltimore, April 9, 1938, before the Lawyers Round Table.

The writer is under similar obligations to Mr. L. R. Carton for "A Paper on William Pinkney," which was read at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Maryland State Bar Association (1904) by the Hon. William Pinkney Whyte. The latter, a grandson of Pinkney and the paternal grandfather of Mrs. Carton, was one of Maryland's most eminent citizens. He served as Mayor of Baltimore, Governor, and United States Senator.

Cf. Monroe Johnson, "William Pinkney, Legal Pedant," in *American Bar Association Journal,* XXII (Sept., 1936), 639-642. For an excellent resumé of Pinkney's life, consult John J. Dolan, "William Pinkney," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIV (New York, 1934), 626-629.

[17] All during the first half of 1787, "Publicola" (Chase) exchanged heated letters with "Aristides" (Alexander C. Hanson) in the columns of the *Maryland Gazette*. They were especially at odds over the degree of independence which delegates should exercise in the legislature. Chase upheld the theory that delegates should be given instructions to which they must conform. Probably the bitterest newspaper feud of the period, however, was that carried on in the same year between Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer and Gabriel Duvall.

[18] Pinkney, *William Pinkney*, p. 17.

Ann, the sister of a future commodore, was the daughter of John Rodgers, who lived on the north side of the Susquehanna river ferry at Perryville, Maryland. As was the custom of the day, the elder Rodgers had a tavern-keeper's license which enabled him to collect a charge from chance passersby who found it convenient to stop at his home on their way to and from Philadelphia. George Washington is reputed to have lodged there many times.[19]

As far as this study is concerned, however, Pinkney's principal accomplishment at this time was being elected to the Maryland ratifying convention to be held in April, 1788, at Annapolis. Other members of the Harford County delegation were Luther Martin, William Paca, and John Love.[20]

II. General Comments on Ratification in Maryland

Little contemporary material is available on Pinkney's role at the Annapolis Convention, nor have later writers been concerned appreciably with it. Under certain circumstances, therefore, it would be fruitless to linger long on this phase of his career. It is this writer's opinion, however, that the meeting involved matters so fundamental that a careful examination is in order.

For Maryland's action was important.[21] Her position as a middle state made ratification essential for geographical considerations alone. Equally important was the effect her action might have on wavering states like Virginia and New York. With Rhode Island and North Carolina definitely outside the fold, it is quite within the realms of probability that unfavorable action at Annapolis would have made ratification by the required nine states impossible. Washington expressed the gravity of the situation in these words: "The fiat of your convention will most assuredly raise the edifice." [22]

[19] William and Ann were married in the front parlor of the Rodgers home which, incidentally, still stands. However, the original doorway has been removed and the structure converted into a double house with two doorways. Mrs. L. R. Carton to Max P. Allen, Oct. 5, 1944. John Rodgers later moved to Havre-de-Grace.

[20] Bernard C. Steiner, "Maryland's Adoption of the Federal Constitution," in *American Historical Review*, V (Oct., 1899), 42. Steiner's monograph was completed in the December issue of the *Review*. It barely mentions Pinkney, but otherwise is the best secondary source which is available on the Maryland Convention of 1788.

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

[22] Washington to Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, Mt. Vernon, April 27, 1788. Quoted from George Bancroft, *History of the Formation of the Constitution*, II (New York, 1882), 283.

Critics like Libby[23] and Beard[24] have found relatively little evidence that ratification was "railroaded" in Maryland. By way of illustration, it is rather difficult to assign to a man like Dr. James McHenry the part of a conspirator seeking to effect a *coup d'état*[25] for realtors. He had signed the Constitution at Philadelphia with misgivings, leading him to record these reasons for his action: his respect for the abilities of those favoring it; the provisions for amendment; "the inconvenience and evils which we labor under and may experience from the present confederation. . . ."[26] During the period from November 26, 1787, when arrangements were made for the convention,[27] until the assembling of the delegates the following April, he played a relatively passive role, rather comparable to that of Washington.[28]

Contemporary Maryland newspapers gave liberally of their columns to a host of contributors.[29] The election of sixty-four Federalists (the word is used with its modern connotation) out of a total of seventy-six delegates can be interpreted only as an

[23] Orin Grant Libby, "The Geographical Distribution of the Vote of the Thirteen States on the Federal Constitution, 1787-8," in *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, I (June, 1894), 32-34, 85-86. Libby was a pioneer in suggesting that economic interests played an important part in Maryland's action. See *ibid.*, p. 33.

[24] Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* (New York, 1925), p. 238.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 218. Beard cites J. W. Burgess as the authority for the Napoleonic implications.

[26] Steiner, *The Life and Correspondence of James McHenry* (Cleveland, 1907), p. 107.

[27] *Votes and Proceedings of the Senate of Maryland*, Nov. Sess., 1787, p. 5 ff. Persons eligible to vote for members of the House of Delegates were permitted to vote for delegates to the ratifying convention. Incidentally, the proposal to delay action until April was carried in the Lower House by only one vote. See *Votes and Proceedings of the House of Delegates of Maryland*, Nov. Sess., 1787, p. 12.

[28] Washington to Jonathan Trumbull, Mt. Vernon, Feb. 5, 1788, in *Documentary History of the Constitution*, IV (Washington, 1905), 478-479; Steiner, *James McHenry*, p. 108.

[29] The most active in defence of the Constitution were A. C. Hanson and the Carrolls. Unfortunately the report of Daniel Carroll, Jenifer, and McHenry to the Legislature regarding the Philadelphia Convention has not been preserved. But Luther Martin's objections were published in full in the *Maryland Gazette; or, the Baltimore Advertiser*, beginning on Dec. 28, 1787, and extending for twelve issues. These were published with minor revisions at Cincinnati in 1838 under the title *The Genuine Information, Laid Before the Legislature of Maryland.* Mercer, the fifth delegate, who also refused to sign the Constitution, made no report to the Legislature (as all the delegates had been requested to do) but campaigned vigorously against ratification. However, Samuel Chase was the most prolific writer against accepting the work of the Philadelphia Convention. The best published sources here are *Essays on the Constitution* (Brooklyn, 1892), pp. 325-383 and *Pamphlets on the Constitution* (Brooklyn, 1888), pp. 217-257, both edited by P. L. Ford.

indication of a genuine majority in favor of adoption.[30] When Steiner and Beard submit figures showing how few people voted in Maryland or any other state,[31] it is largely evidence of the lack of democracy in the 1780's in particular, and the usual apathy of citizens on constitutional problems in general.[32]

Pinkney's exact views on the Constitution at this time are a matter of some dispute, as will be pointed out in section four of this article. To most observers, however, he could be regarded only as an opponent of ratification, possibly even a "malcontent." [33] Are we to assume that this inexperienced young attorney failed to keep his political ear close enough to the ground to properly interpret the rumblings of public opinion?

It is true that Madison had been a bit pessimistic in December.[34] But in February Daniel Carroll declared that the "Antifedls," would merely seek to prevent final action until after the Virginia Convention. Such a maneuver had rather worried Washington and Madison although Carroll thought it likely to fail.[35] Madison was not indulging in wishful thinking when he informed Jefferson two months before the Maryland convention of an expectation "that the opposition will be outnumbered by a great majority." [36] So many similar predictions were made by practical men of affairs that it is impossible for Pinkney not to have realized quite early that he was aligning himself with a forlorn hope.[37]

[30] Quoted by Libby, *op. cit.*, p. 65, from the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 30, 1788.

[31] Steiner, "Maryland's Adoption of the Federal Constitution," in *American Historical Review*, V, 41-44; Beard, *op. cit.*, pp. 238-252.

[32] Beard says that even in New York (where manhood suffrage was the basis of voting in this particular election) less than ten per cent of the electorate participated. See *ibid.*, p. 244.

[33] The historian George Bancroft could not recognize any kind of opposition to the Constitution as legitimate. See his *History of the Formation of the Constitution*, II (New York, 1882), 281-282.

[34] Madison to Thomas Jefferson, New York, Dec. 9, 1787, in *Documentary History of the Constitution*, IV, 396-397.

[35] Daniel Carroll to James Madison, Rock Creek near George Town, Feb. 10, 1788, in *ibid.*, p. 498; James McHenry to George Washington, Baltimore, April 20, 1788, *ibid.*, p. 481, also refers to the prospective effort to concentrate on delaying a final vote.

[36] Madison to Jefferson, New York, Feb. 19, 1788, in *ibid.*, p. 511 ff.

[37] Francis Hopkinson to Jefferson, Philadelphia, April 6, 1788, in *ibid.*, p. 563; Daniel Carroll to Madison, n. p., April 28, 1788, *ibid.*, p. 597. The longest letter extant in Maryland on the question is Daniel Carroll to Madison, n. p., May 28, 1788, in *ibid.*, pp. 636-642. Carroll was one of the unexpected losers in Anne Arundel county as a result of the activities of John F. Mercer and the Chases. He attributed his defeat to the use of circulars emphasizing the need of a bill of rights and to a rumor that he had favored kingship at Philadelphia. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 638-639, and Steiner, *James McHenry*, pp. 101-102.

Pinkney's action apparently did not harm his future prospects.[38] It is an error to believe that the proponents of the Constitution henceforth were the bitter political enemies of the Anti-Federalists of 1788. Luther Martin and Samuel Chase are recorded as Federalists in the late 1790's without any insinuation of their being mere "trimmers." Moreover, such a bold course for a young man may have been the most effective means of bringing him to the attention of the leading men of the day. Certainly it was fine experience for a prospective diplomat and constitutional lawyer.

III. High Lights of the Convention

Even in its infancy the Constitution served as a source of bitter controversy, not only at Philadelphia but during the process of ratification in the several states. In Maryland, the Federalists generally (Hanson excepted) dodged the philosophical arguments advanced by their opponents and concentrated their fire on the financial activities of the leaders during the preceding decade. It so happened that many of the Anti-Federalists had paid depreciated paper money into the State treasury in satisfaction of debts owed British creditors. Hence they were sometimes called the "blacklist junto."[39] Moreover, Martin had obligated himself to the extent of approximately £4,000 for confiscated British estates, while Chase and his partners, the Dorseys, were involved for more than three times that amount.[40] "Steady" was only one of many who declared that Chase opposed ratification of the Constitution "because its establishment would leave him and his desperate adherents in a state of irrecoverable ruin."[41] On the other hand, several of the Federalists had also bought confiscated lands, *e. g.*, James McHenry and Daniel Carroll.[42]

[38] The immediate political effect, however, was rather disastrous to the opponents of ratification. Thus, Jeremiah Chase and Charles Ridgely of William sought unsuccessfully to become Presidential electors, while John F. Mercer and Samuel Chase failed in their Congressional races. See John T. Scharf, *History of Maryland from the Earliest Period to the Present Day*, II (Baltimore, 1879), 549-550.

[39] Benjamin R. Baldwin, "The Debts Owed by Americans to British Creditors, 1763-1802," Ph. D. dissertation in manuscript form, submitted to Indiana University in 1932, p. 224. Baldwin states that the paper money issue was the leading one in the election of delegates to the Annapolis Convention. See *ibid.*, pp. 217-218.

[40] Journal of the Proceedings of the Commissioners. Confiscated British Property, Hall of Records, Annapolis.

[41] *Maryland Gazette; or, the Baltimore Advertiser* (Baltimore), Sept. 28, 1787.

[42] Chase, however, was the only one of these mentioned who had to petition the

The Anti-Federalists, in turn, questioned the integrity of prominent proponents of ratification, a classic example being preserved from the neighboring state of Pennsylvania:

> . . . You will be surprized when I tell you that our public News Papers have announced General Washington to be a Fool influenced & lead [*sic*] by the Knave Dr. Franklin, who is a public Defaulter for Millions of dollars, that Mr. Morris has defrauded the Public out of as many Millions as you please & that they are to cover their frauds by this new Government. . . .[43]

So to some extent many of the arguments advanced concerning the financial status of the principals in this affair may be regarded as being merely specious. Certainly it over-simplifies the Annapolis Convention to divide the delegates into two well-defined groups, regardless of the explanation advanced for such a classification, *e. g.*, personal leadership, the paper money issue, conflicting economic interests, etc. This writer ventures the theory that as a matter of fact there were three fairly distinct groups, party solidarity in the modern sense of course being impossible.

The doughty Judge Alexander C. Hanson, who had written so valiantly and capably as "Aristides" in reply to Martin and Chase, led the rightists.[44] James McHenry of Baltimore Town, George Gale of Somerset County, and Richard Potts of Frederick County served as his chief lieutenants. Two delegates being absent throughout the convention,[45] thirty-eight votes constituted a simple majority. Although the Judge could always muster a handsome majority by bringing pressure to bear between sessions, his followers occasionally fell out of line, as will be noted below.[46]

Legislature for relief. He was freed from his partnership obligations by agreeing to convey to Thomas Dorsey all of his real and personal property. See *Laws of Maryland*, Nov. Sess., 1789, Chapter X.

[43] Francis Hopkinson to Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia, April 6, 1788, in *Documentary History of the Constitution*, IV, 562 ff. Hopkinson declared that Maryland was "infested with a Mr. Martin."

[44] In the *Maryland Gazette* of Jan. 31, 1788, appeared a notice that his "Remarks on the Proposed Plan of a Federal Government" was on sale for two shillings, nine pence, just sufficient to defray the printing costs. Eventually the prices was reduced to twenty-five cents.

[45] Steiner, "Maryland's Adoption of the Federal Constitution," *American Historical Review*, V, 42-44, contains a convenient roster of the delegates. According to Daniel Carroll the two absentees were Federalists. See Carroll to Madison, n. p., April 28, 1788, *Documentary History of the Constitution*, IV, 597.

[46] The most complete record of the various votes taken may be found in *The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution,* edited by Jonathan Elliot, II (Philadelphia, 1876), 547-556.

Regardless of the motives of this group they sought speedy action as the course most likely to insure ratification in other states.

William Paca, one of Pinkney's colleagues from Harford County and another heavy purchaser of confiscated British estates, became the mouthpiece of a little group of moderates, being assisted openly by Thomas Johnson of Frederick County and tacitly by George Plater of St. Mary's County. The latter's conduct as presiding officer has been attributed in the past to the influence of generosity rather than any degree of collaboration with the minority group. The moderates disapproved of the Constitution as submitted but were unwilling to make amendments a *sine qua non* of ratification.[47]

Then there were eleven extremists, consisting of the delegates from only three counties, Paca being excepted. The chief leaders were Samuel Chase[48] and Luther Martin, close associates of Pinkney (although he probably had not enjoyed many contacts with Martin prior to taking up his law practice in Harford County), ably assisted by John Francis Mercer and Jeremiah T. Chase, both of Anne Arundel County. The whole delegation from Baltimore County supported this group.[49] The long patriotic services of the leaders just mentioned preclude an explanation of their opposition on the basis of "rule or ruin" tactics or mere selfish interests. Certainly William Pinkney was not in bad company, even though the combined activities of Paca and Chase failed to circumvent Hanson's grim determination to force ratification without amendments.

The first step in their strategy apparently was procrastination, only forty-seven delegates being present at the first session on Monday, April 21. Plater, the unanimous choice for president,

[47] Hence they finally voted with the rightists, making the count 63 to 11. Consult *Documentary History of the Constitution*, II (Washington, 1894), 104-105; *Maryland Gazette*, May 1, 1788.

[48] Chase, although a resident of Baltimore since 1786 and a representative of that town in the last session of the Legislature, was a member of the Anne Arundel delegation. According to Steiner, *American Historical Review*, V, 42, there were only two other cases like this. However, Americans had not yet adopted the practice of insisting that representatives reside in the district they represented in public assemblies.

[49] Consult the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 30, 1788, quoted in Libby, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-66, for a view that only Baltimore and Harford counties really contained a majority of Anti-Federalists. Hanson, whose testimony is leaned on heavily by secondary writers despite his prejudiced point of view, doubted if a single voting district had a majority against ratification. See Hanson to Madison, Annapolis, June 2, 1788, in *Documentary History of the United States*, IV, 646.

appointed a committee of five to inspect election returns. Two of its members were Johnson and J. T. Chase, the former being chairman. Not until Thursday did Samuel Chase, Luther Martin, and William Paca put in appearance.[50] On Tuesday, various rules of procedure were adopted, one being that all sessions were to be open to the public. Johnson's committee certified the election of seventy-two delegates from the counties and two each from Annapolis and Baltimore.[51]

The following day (Wednesday, April 23) saw the Constitution read for the first time. The momentous decision was reached that after a second reading a full debate was to ensue. But no resolution was to be considered upon any part of the Constitution. There was to be merely the " grand question " of accepting or rejecting it *in toto*.[52] Apparently the rightists had decided in caucus that it was improbable " any new light could be thrown on the subject; that . . . the main question had already, in effect, been decided by the people, in their respective counties." [53] It was their policy to do little talking, scarcely deigning to notice the questions raised by the extremists.[54] In fact, they claimed that most of the week was spent " either in waiting for absent members of the minority, or in the most patient attention to objections, which were familiar to almost every auditor." [55]

Probably the most remarkable feature of the Convention had to do with the consideration of amendments to the Constitution. The primary sources throw comparatively little light on this problem.[56] All that can be said definitely is that with Paca's arrival on Thursday the cause of amendments always had a vigorous proponent. His first act was to ask permission to submit amendments, not as " conditions of ratifications," but as " standing instructions to our

[50] *Documentary History of the Constitution*, II, 103. Paca's arrival on Thursday afternoon brought the total attendance to 74. Pinkney had arrived the day previously. See *ibid.*, p. 102.

[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 100-102.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 103; Elliot, *op. cit.*, p. 547; *Maryland Gazette*, April 24, 1788.

[53] Hanson, " Address of the Majority at the Maryland Ratifying Convention," *Documentary History of the Constitution*, IV, 650. Steiner, *American Historical Review*, V, 207, used this in manuscript form as a part of the Madison Papers. Daniel Carroll is credited with its being preserved in this fashion. Steiner erred in believing that it had never been published. See *ibid.*, p. 220.

[54] Elliot, *op. cit.*, pp. 548-549.

[55] Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 651.

[56] The best secondary accounts are based on Hanson's " Address of the Majority," Elliot's *Debates*, newspapers, and letters. See Scharf, *op. cit.*, II, 542-545, and Bancroft, *op. cit.*, II, 282-284.

representatives in Congress." [57] Johnson, declaring "The request reasonable and that the gentleman ought to be indulged," made a motion to adjourn until the following morning.[58] Possibly having no instructions for such a situation, the rightists permitted the motion to be adopted.

However, when Paca arose to submit his proposals on Friday, George Gale succeeded in having him ruled out of order. The former, naturally, deemed that he had been ill used. It was the contention of the rightists that the adjournment on the preceding afternoon had not signified compliance with Paca's request but merely to give time for reflection on whether he should be permitted to carry out his proposal.[59] Pinkney must have thought of this rationalization in his later dealings with Canning and Circello.

So Paca and Chase finally had to yield to Hanson. The Constitution was ratified in its original form without reservations on Saturday, April 26, by a vote of 63 to 11.[60] The jubilant Federalists henceforth pointed to this vote as evidence of there being little objection to ratification in Maryland, not bothering to mention the reluctance with which the moderates voted affirmatively.

The persistent Paca now once again sought permission to submit his amendments. Many who had previously objected on the grounds that they had been delegated for the express purpose of voting only on accepting or rejecting the Constitution now were disposed to humor him. The vote was 66 to 7 for appointing a committee to consider the matter.[61] To Hanson's disgust they apparently proceeded under the specious reasoning that they were acting as private citizens rather than as an official body.[62] Thus did Pinkney first meet a practice that is a favorite device of diplomacy—the unofficial conversation or letter.

[57] Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 651-652.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 652. McHenry, in a letter to Washington the following month, blamed Johnson for innocently lending himself to a cause injurious to the Federalists. See Steiner, *McHenry*, p. 112. Johnson, writing to Washington on Oct. 10, 1788, accounted thus for his actions: "I was not well pleased at the manner of our breaking up. I thought it to our discredit and should be better pleased with the constitution with some alterations, but I am far from wishing all that were proposed to take place." See *ibid.*, p. 113 (footnote).

[59] Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 652-653.

[60] *Documentary History*, II, 104-105; Elliot, *op. cit.*, p. 549; *Maryland Gazette; or, the Baltimore Advertiser*, May 6, 1788.

[61] Elliot, *op. cit.*, II, 549.

[62] Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 654-655. As a matter of fact, Madison had expressed the view that the legislature had left the door open for the consideration of amendments. See his letter to Jefferson, New York, Dec. 9, 1787, *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison*, I (New York, 1884), 364.

It is outside the scope of this article to give a detailed account of the activities of the committee of thirteen which President Plater appointed. Paca as chairman could rely on the votes of the Chases, Johnson, and Mercer, but Hanson dominated the other seven members. For a time it seemed that thirteen of Paca's twenty-eight suggestions (they constituted a Bill of Rights) might possibly be accepted.[63] After a series of subtle efforts on the part of the opposing leaders to out-maneuver each other, Paca finally submitted no recommendations to the impatient delegates on Monday, although he read the measures which had elicited most approval during the sittings of the committee.[64] Despite the union of the extremists and the moderates, the rightists now forced final adjournment by a vote of 47 to 27.[65] Apparently they had decided that to submit amendments after ratification might look like blind voting to the people of Maryland and might hurt the proponents of ratification in other states.[66]

The sixty-three who had voted for ratification two days previously now signed the Constitution.[67] The eleven who had voted in the negative, along with Paca, signed a kind of minority report, in which they sought to lay before the people the thirteen amendments which had been tentatively approved by the committee of thirteen.[68] It was this latter action which provoked Hanson's "Report of the Majority," written June 2, 1788, but apparently not made use of at the time.[69] He reached the conclusion that the only ground upon which the convention could be condemned was "That it manifested a transient inclination to adopt improper means for attaining a valuable end."[70] Curiously

[63] Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 664; Steiner, *American Historical Review*, V, 220.
[64] Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 663; Elliot *op. cit.*, p. 555.
[65] *Ibid.*
[66] At least this is Steiner's conclusion. See *American Historical Review*, V, 217. Cf. Scharf, *op. cit.*, II, 545.
[67] *Documentary History*, II, 121-122.
[68] Elliot, *op. cit.*, pp. 555-556; they were published in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* (Baltimore), April 29, 1788; in the *Maryland Gazette*, May 1, 1788; and in the *Maryland Gazette; or, the Baltimore Advertiser*, May 6, 1788.
[69] Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 664; Steiner, *American Historical Review*, V, 220. A short notice addressed "To the People of Maryland" appeared in the *Maryland Gazette; or, the Baltimore Advertiser* on May 9, signed "One of the Committee." It declared that a report of the majority would soon be printed. A similar statement appeared in the *Maryland Gazette* on May 8, 1788. This provoked a capable letter on the Convention in the latter paper on May 15, signed "A Member of the Convention."
[70] Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 647.

enough there came a time when most of the minority probably would have been rather inclined to concur. But that was after the adoption of the first ten amendments and a successful demonstration of the superiority of the Constitution over the Articles of Confederation.

IV. Speculation Regarding the Role Played by Pinkney

In his later life, when Pinkney had established himself as one of the best constitutional lawyers in the United States, he usually took the position of a good Hamiltonian. He apparently never referred to his being opposed to ratification in 1788. In time it was almost forgotten. Wheaton, his first biographer, was unable "to find any traces of the part he took in the [Annapolis] deliberations."[71] His second biographer, the Reverend William Pinkney, believed that his uncle cast an "affirmative vote" at the ratifying convention.[72] Although most of the minority later became staunch Federalists, it may be of some value to attempt to account for the actions of the young attorney.

It might be suggested that as the son of a Loyalist he naturally would have sought to prevent the establishment of a strong central government in the United States. Aside from the fact that Pinkney did not share his father's political views, as was earlier pointed out, is the rather astonishing circumstance that opponents of ratification were more likely to have been Sons of Liberty during the Revolution than Loyalists.[73] An interesting sidelight is the view that the mere fact that Attorney General Martin opposed ratification would have impelled many Tories to favor it.[74]

A better thesis would be that gratitude alone would have prevented Pinkney from supporting Hanson, Chase's political enemy (not to mention the fact that it would have been rather awkward for a young man to have opposed an outstanding member of his own delegation like Martin). As a matter of fact, Pinkney probably was of only nominal assistance to Chase at Annapolis. The chances of the minority actually would have been enhanced if

[71] Wheaton, *William Pinkney*, p. 7.
[72] Pinkney, *William Pinkney*, p. 17.
[73] This was particularly true in Virginia. See Hugh B. Grigsby, *The History of the Virginia Federal Convention of 1788* (Richmond, 1890), in volume 9 of the *Collections of the Virginia Historical Society*, p. 49.
[74] Libby, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

Martin's colleague from Harford County had been an older Anti-Federalist who could have added prestige to the little group opposing Hanson. Nevertheless, after Pinkney once chose to offer himself as a delegate, it would have ill befitted him to have acted otherwise at the convention. Many years later he was highly censured for failing to serve with Martin as one of Chase's defenders in the famous impeachment proceedings of 1805.[75] Pinkney finally found it necessary to make the following statement to a friend regarding his relations with Chase:

> . . . I will only say that I am not Mr. Chase's enemy, although in return for unwearied services and a zealous attachment of more than twenty years, during which no discouragements could drive me from him, he has lately been induced to act as if he were mine. Ingratitude is a harsh word, and they who have ventured to apply it to me, should first have been sure of their facts. They will, I presume, take care not to force such observations too much upon my notice.[76]

But the best explanation may well be the simplest one. Throughout his life, whether he was in Annapolis, London, or Washington, Pinkney ever displayed independence of action based upon his convictions. So, in 1788, it probably made no particular difference to him that Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and Alexander C. Hanson were spokesmen for a majority group. He seems to have honestly believed that better arguments were advanced by George Mason, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, and many of his friends in Maryland. Certainly he would have been little affected by comments like Rufus King's on Martin's speech of June 27 and 28 at Philadelphia, that the " principles . . . [were] right, but . . . [could] not be carried into effect." [77]

[75] John Trumbull, *Autobiography, Reminiscences and Letters* (New York, 1841), pp. 240-241.

[76] Pinkney to Cooke, London, Oct. 5, 1806, in Wheaton, *William Pinkney*, pp. 53-54. Two years later, Pinkney told his brother that Chase had given him up entirely. See William Pinkney to Ninian Pinkney, London, April 28, 1808, in Pinkney, *William Pinkney*, p. 50.

[77] Everett D. Obrecht, " The Influence of Luther Martin in the Making of the Constitution of the United States," in the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXVII (Sept., 1932), 188. With the notable exception of the writings of Judge Edward S. Delaplaine, of Frederick, far too many of the distinguished Marylanders of this period have been neglected by biographers.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE IN BALTIMORE, 1814-1815

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF VIGILANCE AND SAFETY

Edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr.

(Continued from Vol. XXXIX, page 224, September, 1944)

The work of the Baltimore Committee of Vigilance and Safety did not come to an end with the repulse of the British at North Point and Fort McHenry. Preparations for the defense of the city were continued: construction of fortifications in the eastern and southern sections was pushed to completion, and careful tests of the supplies of ammunition were made. In addition, those killed in the engagement with the enemy were buried, and the wounded were carried to the hospital for treatment. But perhaps the biggest problem was that of money; how were the numerous and heavy expenditures to be defrayed?

The importance of the financial side of civilian defense was recognized by the business men on the Committee, and a delegation was appointed to go to Washington to discuss the matter with no less a person than the President of the United States. The personnel of this group—Col. John Eager Howard, William Patterson, and William Wilson—was an indication of the urgency of the situation, for these men were among the most prominent citizens of the community. Their report, and that of a second delegation, gave detailed accounts of conversations with President Madison, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Treasury. The solution was a loan from the Committee to the Government; i. e. funds were raised by the Baltimoreans for their own expenses, which were to be repaid by the issuance of Treasury certificates.

Contributions of money were received from private individuals throughout the period, and lists of the donors with the sums given

were published regularly in the newspapers. On October 14, the Baltimore Theatre gave a benefit performance, featuring the comedy, " He Would be a Soldier," and $180 was raised on that occasion.[122] Peale's Museum likewise contributed the proceeds of one day's admissions, though it is doubtful if the total was very large.[123]

The work on the fortifications was performed, during late September and early October, by volunteers from among the military organizations in the city. Company after company offered its services, and it seems to have become a sort of badge of honor to have wielded pick and shovel in manual labor on the earthworks. Among those who earned blisters on their hands were the Company of Bakers, Capt. John Shriver's company of riflemen from York, Pa., and several groups of Frederick County militia. In some places, free people of color were employed at fifty cents a day and rations. Carts and drivers were much in demand, and patriotic citizens who offered their equipment and workmen were much applauded.

The ladies did their share, too, in much the same way as in 1944. On September 12th the newspapers carried an advertisement: " BANDAGES. The Patriotic Ladies of the city, have now an opportunity of rendering assistance to their country-men in arms, by sending old linen or muslin, to Mr. Gatchel at the city Hospital, for the benefit of those who (in case of an engagement) may be wounded. The sooner these things are received the better." A week later (September 20th), Mr. Gatchell published a card of thanks for donations to the hospital, including jellies and preserves of all sorts (strawberry, crabapple, grape, peach, raspberry, currant, guava, pear) and " genuine marmalade." The donors named were Mrs. Samuel Harris, Mrs. Samuel Hollingsworth, Mrs. Henry

[122] " CITY DEFENCE—BALTIMORE THEATRE. The Public are respectfully informed that the profits of this night's performance will be appropriated to aid the fund FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE CITY under the direction of the Committee of Vigilance and Safety. ON FRIDAY EVENING, 14th inst. Will be presented the favorite Comedy of *He would be a Soldier.* After the Comedy will be performed the Broadsword Exercise by Miss Abercrombie, Comic Song by Mr. Jefferson, Military Hornpipe by Mr. F. Durang, Patriotic Epilogue by Mrs. Mason, Song—'Strike the Bold Harp,' by Mrs. Green. To which will be added, the Farce of THE REVIEW." (Baltimore) *American & Commercial Advertiser,* October 13, 1814.

[123] " TASTE & PATRIOTISM. PEALE'S MUSEUM, AND GALLERY OF PAINTINGS, In Holliday Street near the Theatre, will be devoted on Monday the 17th inst. to aid the fund FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE CITY. The sum received on that day will be given to the Committee of Vigilance and Safety." *American,* October 15.

Craig, Mrs. William Woods, Mrs. Isaac McKim, Mrs. William Lorman, and Mrs. John Eager Howard. On October 2nd the steward acknowledged the receipt of ten linen pillow cases " From a worthy Lady " and a demijohn of first quality Maderia wine from MacDonald & Ridgely. As late as October 17th, the hospital received " for the relief of the sick and wounded " four " elegant hams " from General Charles Ridgely and two from Mr. John Hollins.[124]

The Committee itself continued with routine, but important, matters, such as the arrest and trial of persons suspected of hostile views or intentions, and the preparation of scows to be ballasted and sunk in the river.

Baltimore 15th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment— the proceedings of yesterday afternoon were read—

Resolved, That the Requisition from Major Armstead requesting the aid of the committee in procuring Timber and other materials to render the Magazines at the Fort bomb proof be referred to Mr. Jamison with instructions to furnish the same as expeditiously as possible—

The following letter was read agreed to and ordered to be sent—

" To our fellow citizens of the City of Baltimore Carpenters owners of Slaves,

Gentlemen,

You will render an essential service to the Committee of Vigilance and Safety as well as to the City if you can hire us your black Carpenters to work at the Fort at Camp-Look-out, in laying floors &c.—

We want them to-morrow morning at 6 O'clock and let them bring their tools with them—The white Carpenters are all now on duty—15th Sept— 1814 "—Ed: Johnson Chair—

The Committee appointed to superintend the funeral of our brave dead report in part, That, they proceeded this day to the field of Battle and have removed from thence two of the only remaining dead bodies, the third being at the same time removed by his friends—The committee have also procured the removal of two wounded men who were remaining at a House in the vicinity of the Meeting House—Mr. Frisby is requested to ask of Mr. Townsend that he will do them the favour to cause to be completed the interment of the Enemy's dead who are now imperfectly buried—

The following Letter was then read agreed to and ordered to be sent—

[124] All these notices appeared in the columns of the *American*.

" Major Armstead

Sir

This Committee have received with pleasure and are executing with all possible promptitude your requisitions to promote the Security of the Magazines and of our brave Countrymen under your command—

The Committee very respectfully tender to you any services which it may be in their power or in the power of their fellow citizens to render, and they intreat of you unsparingly to make any demands upon them which may contribute to the safety and comforts of those who are immortalizing themselves in the common cause of our beloved Country—We have the Honor to be with the highest consideration, Sir your obt St—

Resolved, That Mr. Daniel Conner be and he is hereby authorised and directed to procure two or three cords of wood four dozen earthen cups & plates three dozen bleeding bowls four dozen Iron spoons, & fifty blankets, immediately for the use of the Hospital—

The Committee received a Communication from Mr. James Beatty which was read and ordered to lie on the table—

The Committee then adjourned to 3 O'clock P. M. this day

Baltimore 16th September 1814

Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of the forenoon were read—

Resolved, That the communication from the Major General of this date be and the same is hereby referred to Col: Howard, Mr. Etting and Mr. Payson who are requested to draft a proper answer thereto and report the same to morrow—

Resolved, That the provisions now on hand which have been cooked for our Soldiery shall be delivered over to the Committee of Relief to be by them disbursed in such manner as they shall think proper—

The following address was read agreed to and ordered to be published—

" The good sense and patriotism of the Editors of News papers throughout the United States, are appealed to, for the suppression of all speculative opinions and communications, respecting the recent and pending interesting events in this city—All the energies, of all the Military as civil authorities, are in active operation to resist and repel an impetuous foe; and with the aid of a kind Providence, they feel sufficient confidence in the result—

The Committee can duly estimate the solicitude of their distant Countrymen, to obtain information of the probable fate of our City; but if this information be derived from unofficial sources it will probably be incorrect and cannot be useful—

The Committee therefore request the Editors of News Papers, to publish with great caution, if indeed they publish at all, any communications from Baltimore, except those from the constituted civil or military authorities;

and the Committee for the gratification of their Countrymen, will occasionally publish such information as may be relied upon—

The Committee then adjourned to 8 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

Baltimore 17th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—and nothing being communicated or proposed for adoption the Committee adjourned to 3 O'Clock P. M. of this day—

Baltimore 3 O'Clock P. M. 17th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—

The Committee received a verbal communication from the Major General requesting that, labourers should be immediately imployed to carry on & complete the works of Defence on Chinquepin Hill—

Resolved That Capt. Joseph Smith the Harbour Master with Capt. S. Poor [125] be and they are hereby requested to assist the Committee heretofore appointed to procure five ships or other Vessels or as many more as may be deemed necessary, and to have them balasted and hauled out into the River to be sunk in such place as Commodore Rodgers shall direct—

Resolved, That F. I. Schwartz,[126] George Auckerman, Ludwig Herring and Samuel Fry [127] be and they are hereby requested to attend during the hours of labour at Fort McHenry for the purpose of superintending the labourers employed therein and of aiding to the best of their skill and judgment those who have charge of the works—

The following Letter was read, agreed to and ordered to be sent—

To Capt. S. Babcock [128]

Sir

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety having full confidence in your ability as an Engineer and your zeal as an officer request you immediately to repair to Fort McHenry for the purpose of directing the completion of the works at that important Fortress and this Committee will render you all the aid that may be requested to fulfil the Requisitions of Major Armstead—We have the Honor to be with the highest Consideration Sir your obt St— "

The following Letter was read & agreed to and ordered to be sent—

To Maj. DeFouvel

Sir

The Government of the United States having placed Capt. Babcock as an Engineer at this Port and as Fort McHenry is the property of the

[125] Samuel Poor, sea captain, 16 Albemarle St.
[126] Frederick Schwartze, merchant, dw. 66 Hanover St.
[127] Samuel Frey, merchant, 108 Sharp St.
[128] Samuel Babcock, of Massachusetts, 2nd lt. of engineers 1808, 1st lt. July 1812, captain Sept. 1812, major 1819, resigned 1830.

United States and commanded by a United States officer, the Committee of Vigilance and Safety now deem it proper that any works to be made at that place should be projected and superintended by that officer—They therefore avail themselves of this occasion to return their thanks for the prompt offer you made of your services at the moment of threatened danger—

But for the before mentioned reasons the Committee will in future dispence with your services there and will avail themselves of your good offices whenever occasion may require—We have the honor to be with the highest consideration Sir your obt—St— [129]

The following Letter was read agreed to and ordered to be sent—

To Major General Samuel Smith—

Sir

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety have to acknowledge the receipt of your Letter of yesterday and to assure you that, they concur with you as to the propriety of a continuance of our joint and best exertions to sustain & improve our means of resistance—The committee are sensible that we ought to avail ourselves of the opportunity afforded us by the suspension of the enemy's attack, to complete our works, and that it would be unwise to relax in our preparations for defence—The committee embrace the opportunity to assure you that all the means in their power will be used to aid you in these necessary measures—we have the honor to be with the highest consideration Sir your obt st—

The committee then adjourned to 9 O'Clock tomorrow morning

Baltimore 18th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday afternoon were read—and nothing being communicated or proposed for adoption the Committee adjourned to 4 O'Clock P. M. of this day—

Baltimore 4 O'Clock P. M. 18 September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—

The committee received a communication from Major General Smith inclosing a Letter from Brigadier General Winder relative to the necessary articles required to make the Magazine at Fort McHenry Bomb proof—

Whereupon the following letter was read, agreed to and ordered to be sent—

[129] The *American* of September 20th printed an open letter from Lt. Col. DeFauvel "To the Inhabitants of Baltimore," offering his services for the construction of two mortars "which will throw a bomb the distance of three miles." The only compensation desired was that the shells should bear the name of the inventor—DeFauvel.

To Maj. Genl S. Smith

Sir

Your letter inclosing a communcation from Brig. Genl. Winder relative to a requisition for the necessary materials for the purpose of making the Magazine at Fort McHenry Bomb proof has been duly received and shall meet with our immediate attention—

We beg you to be assured that this committee will feel great pleasure in cooperating with the Military in any further additional measures for the defence of our City—

With great Respect we are your Obt Sts—

Resolved, That Messiers Warner and Berry be and they are hereby appointed to furnish the Bricks, Lime, Sand, Brick-layers and Carpenters that shall be found necessary to complete the works at Fort McHenry agreeably to the requisition of the Major General—

Resolved, That Mr. Burke and Mr. Jamison be and they are required to furnish Timber as required by the Major General's communication of this date for the completion of the works at Fort McHenry—

The committee then adjourned to 8 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

Baltimore 19th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read

The Committee received a communication from Joseph Townsend, of the Society of Friends, who had been requested to bury the Dead found on the ground on which the Battle of the 12th Inst was fought, stating that he had caused to be buried such of the British dead as were found lying on the surface and reinterred those that were not sufficiently covered amounting in all to forty two: and that two of the American Dead found on the field of Battle he had caused to be decently interred, the numbers brought to Town by the Friends of the deceased not known (stated however in committee to be 17) and that in performing these offices as required he had incurred some expense as per account therefore—

Ordered That the Committee of Accounts pay the expense incurred in burying the dead as abovementioned immediately—

The Committee then adjourned to 3 O'Clock of this day

Baltimore 3 O'Clock P. M. 19th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of the forenoon were read—

The Committee received a Communication from Com: Rodgers relative to certain transactions at Fort McHenry—therefore

Resolved, That the Letter from Com: Rodgers of this date be and the same is hereby referred to Col. Howard and Mr. Payson with a request that they will consider thereof, confer with Maj. Armstead and report to this Committee at the next meeting—

The Committee received a letter from Mr. E. B. Caldwell directed to Mr. Robert Barry, says that, " Col. Monroe had authorised him (Caldwell) to state that if the corporation or inhabitants, would have Fort McHenry bomb proof it would be reimbursed by government at the end of the war " and that " the particular mode of transacting the loan and doing the work may be the subject of communication with the corporation or citizen "— which letter was read and ordered to be filed—

Resolved, That Dr. Schwartze junr. be and he is hereby authorised and requested to have mortars and shells made and cast as required by Maj. Armstead under the direction of Capt. Babcock—.

The Committee then adjourned to 9 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

Baltimore 20th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment— The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved That, the Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Payson and Mr. Lorman be and they are hereby appointed to wait on the Marshal and know if there [are] any Alien Enemies now in this City and if so that the Marshal be urged & requested to send them out of Town immediately.

The committee to who the letter of Commodore Rodgers of the 19th instant was referred beg leave to Report, that, they have conferred with Major Armstead who informed them that he was not acquainted with the person alluded to before he was introduced to him on the ground by Mr. Kelso or some other person—That supposing he had some knowledge as an Engineer he wished he might be employed, but is now satisfied that the said person is not acquainted with the kind of works necessary in Fort McHenry yet he does not consider him as such a dangerous person as to make it necessary to arrest him—The Committee are therefore of opinion that no further proceeding is necessary at this time, but as every precaution ought to be taken in the present state of things they recommend that an eye be had to the person in order to ascertain as far as can be done his character, and in case of his being missing that it should immediately be known, or if circumstances should be discovered which might excite stronger suspicions that then he may be arrested—

Which Report was read and concurred with—

This Committee having been informed that the Forces under the Command of Brig. Genl. Winder, and Com: Rodgers with the men under his command were ordered away—and it appearing from an estimate of the expenditures already incurred, and a review of the works of Defence which have been completed & are now carrying on under the Superintendance of this Committee, as directed by the Military Authorities and at the Cost of the City of Baltimore, that the expense of Fortifying our City is likely to be very considerable also the heavy losses of many of our fellow citizens whose property has been used or destroyed in order to contribute to our general safety—And this Committee feeling a Confidence in the justice and liberality of the Government: therefore—

Resolved, That Col. John E. Howard, Mr. William Patterson and Mr. William Wilson be and they are hereby appointed to wait on the President of the United States & Heads of Departments and respectfully communicate to them the situation of the City of Baltimore; to state the amount of the sums of money that have been already expended as well as the amount that will probably yet be wanted; to endeavour to obtain from the Government an appropriation sufficient to reimburse all expenditures that have heretofore been made and also to meet any expense that may hereafter be incurred in erecting and completing necessary Works of Defence, as well as to reimburse our fellow citizens for any injury or destruction of their property made necessary for the better defence of the City: And finally that they be charged to beg of the Executive to hold a sufficient Military Force near Baltimore so long as the Enemy remain in any considerable strength on the waters of the Chesapeake—

The committee then adjourned to 9 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

Baltimore 21st September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment; the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That Mr. Stouffer, Mr. Dugan & Mr. Alricks be and they are hereby appointed to ascertain and as far [as] practicable adjust our expenditures and disbursements among the military and to procure proper vouchers for the same—

It being supposed expedient for the greater protection of our City that, a suitable number of the good Guns that can be procured including twelve pounders and those of larger Calibre be mounted on sufficient Carriages, therefore—

Resolved, That the Committee appointed on Gun Carriages, be requested to take to their aid Col: Harris,[130] Maj: Thomas Tenant[131] and Cap. Stiles[132] who at the request of this Committee will render all the aid in their power, and that they proceed without delay to have them so mounted on Carriages with all possible expedition, as will place them in an efficient state for Service—and that the same Committee enquire w[h]ether Ball sufficient of the different sizes required are Cast, and whether in a convenient situation for use—

Resolved That Mr. Etting be requested to wait on Capt. Evans at Fort McHenry, and converse with him generally on the state of the powder at the Fort—

The Committee then adjourned to 9 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

Baltimore 22d. September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment— The proceedings of yesterday were read—

[130] David Harris (1770-1844), merchant, dw. Mulberry nr. Howard St.
[131] Thomas Tenant (1769-1836), merchant, George St.
[132] George Stiles (1760-1819), merchant, dw. King George St.—mayor, 1816-19.

Resolved, That the Committee on Gun Carriages be & they are hereby authorised and requested to purchase for the use of the City of Baltimore, of Mr. Dorsey fifteen of the eighteen pound Guns now in the care of Maj. Tenant, which Guns shall be proved—

The Committee then adjourned to 9 O'Clock tomorrow morning

Baltimore 23d. September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

Mr. Etting who was appointed to enquire & report to this committee the nature and strength of the powder at Fort McHenry Reported, That the powder was yesterday tried and found to be of the following proofs, to wit: Canon 170 yards—Musket 171—F. Duponts, 205, according to the usual mode of 1 oz troy weight—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 24th September 1814—

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of yesterday were read—

The committee appointed to proceed to Washington and wait on the President of the United States and Heads of Departments, beg leave to report that they waited on the President who received them with marked attention and shewed every disposition to afford us all the means in the power of the Government for the defence of our city, consistent with the attention due to the protection of other places—With respect to the expences for the fortifications he observed that, all objects which can be brought under the appropriation laws would be immediately paid—That the part for which no appropriations are made would be included in an equitable arrangement which would be made with respect to Baltimore as well as other sea ports, and that the Government was disposed to be liberal in those arrangements—That with respect to the disposition of the troops particular attention would be paid to the protection of our City, and that the troops under marching orders were intended to be stationed at some suitable point between Washington and Baltimore so as promptly to move to the assistance of either place—

The committee then waited on the acting Secretary of War who appeared disposed to give them every satisfaction in his power, and freely entered into a candid explanation of the views and intentions of the Government—That with respect to the movements of the troops they should be stationed at some convenient distance from Baltimore so as promptly to come to our assistance, and read to us a letter to General Smith on the subject—That as to the bomb-proof fortifications in the Fort and other works he had written to General Smith to have them done at the expense of the Government, that as to other works which the city might deem necessary the Government would be liberal in reimbursing the expense, but he intimated that the city would have to advance the money; he added that,

the Government was not disposed to be parsimonious—He mentioned the propriety and his desire that the war department may from time to time be furnished with estimates of the probable expenses through Capt Babcock and General Smith—

On their return the Committee met Douglas' Brigade at Vansville, Lavals Horse at Snowdens and the regular troops afterwards, all apparently on their march to Washington—Upon meeting Gen. Winder he mentioned that, Genl. Smith had issued orders for these troops to take post somewhere near the Patuxent, and he did not seem to know the reasons of their moving further—Whether the change of the disposition for the troops has been owing to information received since the Committee was with the Secretary of War, or owing to a want of previous arrangements on the Patuxent for the accommodation of the troops or to whatever cause the committee are unable to determine

Which Report was read and approved—

Resolved, That, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Lorman, Mr. Buchannan and Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Frisby be and they are hereby appointed to take into consideration and Report the plan most advisable for obtaining the funds required to complete the Defences of this City—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 25th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment: the proceedings of yesterday were read

Mr. Frisby from the Committee who were appointed to investigate cases of individuals who may be accused of being in the constant habit of making use of very intemperate and improper expressions calculated to produce disunion and to defeat the preparations making for the defence of our city made report of sundry treasonable conduct of a certain person named John Kingsmore and a certain other person named John Paul—therefore

Ordered That the said Report be referred to the Mayor with a request that he would send for the witnesses and examine them & have them bound over to appear and testify against the said Kingsmore & Paul and that the said Kingsmore & Paul be arrested and imprisoned to answer the charge of High Treason—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 26th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That Mr. Jamison be and he is hereby added to the committee heretofore appointed on Guns & Gun Carriages—

Ordered, That the Secretary address a letter to General Douglas respectfully requesting him to release the waggon and team of a Mr. Curts which he alledges has been impressed by an officer under Genl. Douglas' command—

The committee appointed to take into consideration and report the plan most adviseable for obtaining the funds required to complete the Defences of the city beg leave to recommend—

That an estimate as accurate as may be practicable be made of the expenses already incurred and to be incurred

That a loan to the United States be opened for a sum to cover the above estimate, the subscribers agreeing to receive United States stock at current value in payment—

That the sums which have been subscribed & placed at the disposal of the Committee of Vigilance be deemed a part of the loan hereby authorised—

That the money thus authorised to be borrowed or so much thereof as may be necessary shall be exclusively appropriated to the Defences and wants of Baltimore—

That Mr. James A. Buchanan, Mr. William Lorman and Mr. Henry Payson be and they are hereby appointed as deputies to proceed to Washington for the purpose of arranging with the Executive or with Congress as to the expenditure of the money, delivery of the United States stock, &c &c; and that the deputation be specially instructed to require that all expenditures incurred or to be incurred for the defense of Baltimore shall be defrayed out of the above fund, if made under the requisition of, or if sanctioned by the commanding General; and that such requisition or sanction, shall legalize all accounts the payment of which is evidenced by sufficient vouchers—all which is respectfully submitted—

Which Report was read and acceded to—

Resolved, That the deputation of members of the Committee appointed to wait on the Executive and Congress as to the expenditure of money &c be and they are hereby requested to remonstrate with the President of the United States against the removal of the Troops destined originally for the defence of Baltimore, as their continuance here is deemed indispensably requisite to the safety and protection of this place—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 27th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That Mr. Taylor, Mr. Woelper, and Mr. Kelso be and they are hereby appointed to superintend the repairing and erection of works of Defence on Chinquipin Hill as required by the Major Generals communication of this date—

It being the opinion of this committee that in the event of the Steam Boat going out of our River she will be liable to capture by the Enemy: and that if such capture should take place the Boat would greatly facilitate the operations of the Enemy seriously to our injury—therefore—

Resolved, That Mr. Waters and Mr. Jessup be and are hereby appointed to wait on the owners or agents of the Steam Boat and represent to them

the serious consequences apprehended by exposing the Boat to Capture and to request that she may be kept within the Basin—

The committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 28th September 1814

The Committee of Vigialnce & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That the Chairman of this Committee be and he is hereby authorised and requested to offer a reward of one hundred dollars for the apprehending and securing in Gaol so that he may be brought to trial, a certain John Paul who has been charged on strong circumstantial evidence of the crime of High Treason against the United States—

Resolved, That Mr. Jessup and Mr. Warner with Col: Maher [133] and Mr. Robert C. Long be and they are hereby authorised and requested to visit Fort Covington and Fort Patapsco and inspect the situation of the works and report to this committee tomorrow—

Whereas it has been represented to this committee by the superintendants of the labourers that, the five barrels of whiskey furnished by Messrs John C. White & Sons [134] are of a quality which cannot be made use of—therefore—

Resolved That the said five barrels of whiskey be returned to Messrs White & Sons as unfit for use and to receive other whiskey of good quality in lieu thereof or otherwise as Messrs White & Sons shall think proper—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 29th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

The Committee were informed by a letter of this date from Mr. Joseph H. Nicholson [135] Captain Elect of the Artillery Fencibles that the Company under his command would volunteer their services to labour one day on the works of Defence and that they would turn out for that purpose on Saturday next— [136]

Ordered That the Chairman in reply to Capt Nicholson say to him that this committee will thankfully accept of the patriotic tender of his company's services—

Mr. Jessup from the Committee appointed to visit and inspect the situation of Forts Covington & Patapsco made—

Report, That they did proceed to Fort Covington and did examine every part as minutely as possible and they are sorry to say that they found the

[133] Martin Maher, merchant, 11 Spear's Wharf.

[134] John C. White & Sons, merchants, East nr. Holliday St.

[135] Joseph H. Nicholson (1770-1817), president of Commercial & Farmers' Bank, dw. 276 Baltimore St.

[136] The *American* of September 30th had an advertisement by Nicholson ordering his men to assemble on Washington Square "precisely at 6 o'clock . . . in working dress and furnished with a day's provision."

Platform in very shattered and dangerous situation—almost from one end to the other of the gunways, apparently all parts of the platform had received an equal shock, and from every information they were able to collect was caused by all seven of the Guns having been fired at or near the same time—and that it would be attended perhaps with very fatal consequences should a similar exertion be required in the present situation—and that in their opinion immediate attention is necessary to make the required repairs—some other parts, but which are of a trivial nature, they think deserve attention—

Fort Patapsco, they conseive, has received little or no injury—All which is respectfully submitted—

Which report was read approved and ordered to be shewn to the Major General—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 30th September 1814

The Committee of Vigilance and Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Resolved, That the Chairman of this Committee be and he is hereby requested to inform the Marshal of the character and conduct of Lewis Bryers an alien enemy now in Gaol and that he request the Marshal to have him removed according to law—

Resolved, That Maxwell now in custody by order of this Committee be continued in Gaol until he gives security for his good behaviour according to law—

Resolved, That the owners of the Steam Boat be and they are hereby permitted to start her on monday next and to continue her running so long as there is no danger of Capture by the Enemy—

The Committee was informed that Capt. George I. Brown's [137] Artillery Company offered their services to labour one day on the works of Defence, and would for that purpose turn out when requested any day after Sunday next—

Ordered That the Chairman say to Capt. Brown that the services of the Company under his command will be thankfully accepted and that he will be duly apprised of the day on which their patriotic offer may be executed—

The Committee then adjourned—

Baltimore 1st October 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—the proceedings of yesterday were read—

Ordered, That Mr. James Wilson inform Capt. Brown that the proffered services of the company under his command will be acceptable on Tuesday next and that the point of labour shall be designated—

The committee deputed to proceed to Washington, to make certain

[137] George I. Brown (1778-1820), brewer, King George St., dw. 25 N. Gay St.

representations in behalf of the committee of Vigilance & Safety of Baltimore, beg leave to

Report, That they have had an interview with the Secretary of War on Tuesday afternoon, in which they informed the Secretary, that considerable sums had been expended, and would still be required, in providing for the defence of Baltimore; that to meet these, the deputation was authorised to loan to the United States, a sum sufficient to cover them; with the understanding, that as much thereof as might be necessary, should be so applied; and with the further understanding that the expenditures should be deemed to be legal, if made under the requisition or sanction of the Commanding General—The Secretary, expressed, in general terms his acquiescence with the views of the committee, and his belief, that the President of the United States to whom he would present us, would meet the wishes of the deputation—

That according to appointment, the committee was on wednesday morning presented to the President, to whom they made known the nature and objects of their mission—The President expressed, generally, his desire to gratify the citizens of Baltimore; but he suggested, that if our expenditures were informally made, there might be serious legal impediments to their adjustment—The subject underwent considerable discussion, and it was finally agreed, that a representation, in writing should be made by the deputation, which should be liberally considered and to which we should receive a written reply—The deputation, in conformity with this arrangement, prepared a representation, and presented it to the Secretary of War about three O'clock the same day, and a copy of which is herewith presented to the Committee of Vigilance & Safety—

That about 12 O'Clock on Thursday, the deputation being without a reply to their representation, called on and had an interview with the Secretary of War; who preceded his observations, by reading to the deputation, from a Copy in his own hand writing, the items of expenditure, with a list of which the committee had furnished him; and he then remarked, that independently of the circumstances of these expenditures being made under the requisition of the Military commander, which of itself was sufficient to legalize them; they appeared to be such as would be covered by existing laws; that possibly there were some, which would require a liberal construction from the head of the Department, and the deputation might be assured that such liberality would cheerfully be extended to such cases—The Secretary further observed, that the successful resistance which Baltimore had made, was of the utmost importance; whether considered in reference to its own value, or as an example to other Cities, or in its beneficial effects by inspiring confidence throughout the Country—That he was well aware, both from reason and experience, that in times of imminent peril, such as has [been] recently the case with Baltimore, the Commanding General must incur expense, which a rigid construction of law, would perhaps not embrace; but that equity gave the fairest claim for the sanctioning of such expenditures, and that to this he would be particularly attentive—To these observations, he added a recom-

mendation, that future expenditures should be in accordance with established forms—In reply to the observations respecting a loan of money the Secretary read to the Committee, and furnished a Copy of the arrangement made with a Committee from New York; and the deputation were informed, that arrangements would be made with Baltimore as soon as a Secretary of the Treasury should be appointed—In relation to an adequate force for the defence of Baltimore, the Secretary informed the deputation, that the Pennsylvania troops were ordered to be stationed there, and that those which had been under the command of Genl. Winder were ordered to encamp four or five miles beyond Snowden's—That the last intelligence from the Fleet was that they had principally descended the Bay from Patuxent, that many vessels had gone to sea, and it was believed the greater part of the residue would follow—That the people of Baltimore might rely with confidence, on the Watchfulness of Government for their protection; that a large augmentation of force was contemplated (under the expectation of reinforcements having arrived at Bermuda) and that as much thereof as would be satisfactory, should be appropriated to the defence of Baltimore—The Secretary concluded, by observing, that the president had the representation of the committee under consideration, & coincided with him the secretary in the observations which he made to the deputation; that a written reply confirming those observations, would be made, so soon as an unusual pressure of business would permit; that this should not be delayed more than four or five days, and that until its receipt, he requested the committee of Vigilance & Safety to consider his observations as confidential—

All which is respectfully submitted—

Which Report was read and approved and the accompanying documents ordered to be filed—

The committee then adjourned to 10 O'Clock on Monday morning—

Baltimore 3d October 1814

The Committee of Vigilance & Safety met pursuant to adjournment—The proceedings of Saturday were read—

The committee were informed that the company of Independent Blues under the command of Capt. A. R. Levering [138] offered their services to perform a days labour on the works of Defence when required—therefore

Ordered that the services of Capt. Leverings Company be accepted and the thanks of this Committee presented to him by the chairman—

Resolved, That the committee on Gun Carriages have prepared as soon as possible trucks for each Gun at Fort Camp look out such as the Major General shall approve—

Resolved, That all free people of Colour be and they are hereby ordered to attend daily, commencing with Wednesday morning the 5th instant, at the different works erecting about the City for the purpose of labouring

[138] Aaron R. Levering (d. 1852), paper store, 901 Baltimore St.

therein, and for which they shall receive an allowance of fifty cents pr. day together with a Soldiers ration—

Resolved That Capt. George Stiles and Capt. Isaac Phillips be and they are hereby authorised to enforce the preceding order and to call to their aid the different Military companies of Exempts or such other aid as may be necessary to its complete execution—

Resolved, That our fellow citizens who are exempt from militia duty be and they are hereby earnestly invited to labour on the fortifications either in person or by substitute, and in the latter case to furnish the substitutes with notes to the superintendents requesting them to certify thereon that the bearer had performed his duty—

Resolved, That the thanks of this Committee be and they are hereby tendered to the military associations who have volunteered their services to labour, and that the committee will be gratified by a continuance of military aid on the Fortifications—

Mr. Frisby from the Committee who were appointed to investigate cases of persons who were alledged to be seditious or disaffected to the Country made Report of sundry treasonable conduct of a certain Luman W. Bishop [139] of Fells Point—therefore

Ordered, That the said Report be referred to the Mayor with a request that he would send for the witnesses examine and have them bound over to testify against the said Bishop and that the said Bishop be arrested and imprisoned to answer the charge of High Treason against the United States—

The Committee then adjourned to 10 O'Clock tomorrow morning—

(*To be continued.*)

[139] Liman Bishop, teacher, 14 Ann St.

EARLY MARYLAND BOOKPLATES

By Edith Rossiter Bevan

Ownership of a bookplate implies ownership of books—books which the owner values sufficiently to place therein his personal mark of approval or affection—his bookplate.

The bookplates owned in Maryland over a century ago ran from the elaborately engraved family coat of arms to the naive printed name label, but all bear silent testimony to the fact that many of the sports-loving Marylanders of the eighteenth century were also men of culture who cared for reading as well as for racing.

Many of these bookplates belonged to prominent professional men—lawyers, physicians and clergymen, whose fine libraries are known to us today through the careful analysis of Joseph Towne Wheeler in his series of articles on eighteenth century libraries in Maryland which have appeared in the *Maryland Historical Magazine*. Sometimes these libraries were handed down intact to a son who bore the same name, and the bookplate was used by succeeding generations, which makes it difficult to assign definite ownership to some bookplates which did double duty.

In 1880 the Honorable J. Leicester Warren, later Lord de Tabley, published in London *A Guide to the Study of Book Plates* which is still a standard work and his nomenclature of the different types of bookplates is in general use today. He groups into definite periods the four recognized types of eighteenth century armorial bookplates and gives to each period a suggestive name and approximate dates. Approximate, because in every period there was a transition and over-lapping of styles.

The Maryland colonist, being still an Englishman, followed zealously the fashions of London and what was in vogue there became fashionable a little later in Maryland. As the infant colony lacked fine engravers, the bookplates, until after the middle of the century were English-made and for the most part were ordered by the owner through his agent there. Some Maryland gentlemen sent their sons to England to complete their education and a few plates which attest the fact that the owner attended

one of the Inns of Court were doubtless ordered by young lawyers while still in London—a feather in the cap, so to say, to bring back to Maryland. Typical of such is the plate of John Leeds Bozman, Esqr. of the Middle Temple, in the collection of Maryland bookplates at the Enoch Pratt Free Library.

The earliest bookplates listed by Warren are known as *Early English*, 1700-1740. They may be recognized by the profuse, heavy mantling that springs from the helmet and surrounds the face of the shield, reminiscent of the giant periwigs of that day. The shape of the shield is plain,—severely simple in outline. No accessory ornamentation is introduced and the effect is dignified and formal. Very few of these rare plates have come down to the present day, but a good example may be seen in the plate of " Charles Carroll of Ye Inner Templer Esqr, Second Son of Daniell Carroll of Litterlouna Esqr. in the Kings County in the Kingdom of Ireland. 1702." This plate is in the Maryland Historical Society's collection of bookplates. Charles Carroll, the immigrant, came to Maryland about 1686 and his plate is the earliest known bookplate of Maryland ownership.

The next type chronologically is the *Jacobean*, 1740-1760. Although known as Jacobean it is characteristic also of the Queen Anne and early Georgian periods and may be identified by its absolute symmetry and richly carved appearance. The mantling behind the helmet often resembles the heavy wooden carvings of that day,—sometimes it extends below the helmet, partially framing the shield. The shield is of graceful shape, with edges slightly concave in outline, and is placed against a background or lining composed of small patterns, known variously as fish-scale, diaper and brick wall. Enclosing the whole is a symmetrically curved frame which recalls the carved mouldings of that period. A scallop shell in concave is an accessory often placed directly above or below the shield. Cornucopias of fruit or flowers, sometimes grotesque faces or cherubs are introduced in the ornamentation of the frame. The bookplate of " Jacobus Tilghman, Arm'r, Annapolis," in the collection of the Maryland Historical Society is a fine example of the Jacobean type.

Just as the name Chippendale has become associated with a certain style of furniture, the *Chippendale* bookplate, 1760-1775, is quite distinct from the preceding types and reflects the spirit of that golden age which culminated with the Revolutionary War.

The shield is never symmetrical in outline, resembling an oyster shell or the human ear in shape. Framing the escutcheon is a rococo border of shellwork and scrolls. In lieu of mantling, graceful sprays of foliage and flowers spring in a natural manner from the sides of the frame, and sometimes, nestling inconspicuously among the branches are small objects pertaining to the owner's profession—a quill, an ink well, a globe. Sometimes little landscapes were introduced. The owner's name was often placed in a graceful bracket which supported the shield, as in the plate at the Pratt Library of Anthony Stewart, Annapolis, Maryland, the owner of the brig *Peggy Stewart*, of tea party fame. Sometimes the name is engraved below the shield in fac-simile of handwriting as occurs in the plate of Samuel Chase, the Signer, in the Sill collection at the Baltimore Museum of Art. The delicate charm of the Chippendale plate proved to be its weakness and caused its downfall, for in unrestrained hands, the ornamentation degenerated into a riot of irrelevant, incongruous objects set in an over-loaded frame. Such plates are known today as debased Chippendale.

After the Revolutionary War the swing of the pendulum once more brought a revision in styles. The bookplates of this latter period are known as *Ribbon and Wreath*, a type which remained in vogue till the end of the century and beyond. They are in direct contrast to the fancy-free Chippendale plates, being simple and chaste in design. No mantling is shown nor do they have any background or frame. The shield is usually heart-shaped, sometimes suspended from a wall-pin by a ribbon or festoon; sometimes the escutcheon is supported by crossed sprays of holly and palm or sprays of foliage and flowers as seen in the plate of James Carroll in the collection of Maryland bookplates at the Pratt Library.

Shortly before the turn of the century originality began to assert itself and new types of bookplates sprang into being, notably allegorical, pictorial and landscape plates. These types were well-known in England where they had been used for some time, but never proved generally popular in Maryland. The finest example of a pictorial-armorial plate is in the Sill collection—the plate of Ric'd Bennett Lloyd, Esqr., which was probably engraved in London when Captain Lloyd was with the King's Life Guards.

Seldom found in Maryland were the highly specialized literary

or musical bookplates, and still rarer the style known as "Library Interior," though Maryland is rich in claiming three notable examples of the last named type—all obviously the work of one master engraver, but who he was is an unsolved riddle today. His plate for Isaac Steele is in the Maryland Historical Society's collection, that of William Bond Martin in the Sill collection and the Benjamin Ogle Tayloe plate is in the Baillie collection at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

The crest alone, with the owner's signature engraved below was often used—a simple and person bookplate. Of greater popularity, however, in the newly democratic State was the engraved name label with finely wrought border, generally oblong in shape through oval and circular wreaths often enclosed the name. Belonging to no special period they have outlasted them all, for their modern counterpart is often seen today.

Contemporaneous with all the fore-mentioned types of bookplates were the printed name labels which merely recorded ownership of a book, occasionally giving a residence and date, as does the plate of Robert Goldsborough, Attorney-at-Law, Easton, Talbot Co. 1772, which is in the Sill collection, but mostly they were modest and unassuming with quaint borders of ornamental type—the product of a local printer. Only two specimens of bookplates belonging to Maryland women are known to us today, both printed labels. The plate of Prudence Gough, Perry Hall, which is in the collection at the Maryland Historical Society, was probably placed in volumes of sermons, for Mrs. Gough was strongly religious. The bookplate of Mary Emerson Trippe, who married Robert Goldsborough in 1768, was found in two volumes of "The Foundling" by Fielding, which are still in possession of her descendants.

Quite distinct and in a class by themselves are the wood-cut plates which Thomas Sparrow of Annapolis engraved for prominent Marylanders of his day, and though they do not rank high as works of art, they are of special interest because of their Maryland origin. All of Sparrow's plates are similar in design, several of them are identical, the only difference being in the printed name of the owner. They may be recognized by his distinguishing mark of thirteen stars set in a small shield in the top center of the wood-cut border. On several plates the initials F. G. are found above the signature—what they signify is not known today. Four bookplates by Sparrow are in the Sill collection, the plates

of Gabriel Duvall, John R. Plater, Richard Sprigg, jun., and John Allen Thomas. Two plates he engraved for John Shaw, cabinet-maker and silver-smith of Annapolis are in the Baillie collection, as are the plates of Alexander Frazier and Thomas Bond. All of Sparrow's bookplates are signed; several of them are dated, which add to their interest.

With the exception of a few wood-cut plates other than those by Sparrow, all engraved bookplates were done from copper plates until about 1820, when steel plates were introduced and superseded copper engraving. Though many creditable bookplates were engraved during the next few decades, they lack the individual distinction found in the older plates. Prevalent were the so-called plain armorial bookplates with spade-shaped shield—competent and correct, but cold as is commercial engraving today. Popular also, were name labels embellished with caligraphic flourishes, though some conservative gentlemen preferred a plate resembling their visiting card. The fore-shadow of the Victorian age of mediocrity was upon the State of Maryland.

Many of the early booksellers in Annapolis and Baltimore had a circulating library in connection with their shop, and used a printed trade card or announcement in place of a bookplate. Ladies and gentlemen were invited to become 'Readers,' and the terms of subscription to the library were generally given. Of more interest perhaps to an antiquarian than to a collector of fine bookplates, these quaint trade cards should not be overlooked. Exceptional is the handsomely engraved card of William Aikman, who advertises his shop in Annapolis just before the Revolutionary War, which may be seen in the Maryland collection at the Pratt Library.

Doubtless many bookplates of Maryland ownership have passed into the limbo of lost trivia. Old houses and their contents have been destroyed by fire. Old families have died out, their household effects scattered. Some families have left the state, taking their goods and chattels with them. Consequently a complete record of early Maryland bookplates is an impossibility, but it is to be hoped that some of these forgotten bookplates will come to light, and rescued from oblivion, will drift back to one of the three fine collections in Baltimore where they will be cherished and preserved for posterity.*

* Mrs. Bevan has presented to the Society the complete draft of the Check List of Early Maryland Bookplates and Trade Cards which she has compiled from the holdings of various institutions and individuals.

POLITICS IN MARYLAND DURING THE CIVIL WAR

By Charles Branch Clark

(Continued from Vol. XXXIX, page 161, June, 1944)

THE MARYLAND DELEGATION IN CONGRESS, 1862-1865

The activities of the Maryland delegation in the United States Congress during the war years throw much light upon feeling within the State. Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives expressed ideas on the war issues for the most part in accordance with the wishes of their constituents. They presented resolutions from the State Legislature; they supported bills that would be of benefit to the State; and they protested vigorously against any measure calculated to inflict injury upon the institutions of the State. They were quick to come to Maryland's defense at all times, although there was not always full agreement even among those representing the State as to what its best interests were. An attempt is made to analyze here only those activities dealing specifically with the situation in Maryland.

During the war period Maryland was represented in the Senate by Anthony Kennedy, James Alfred Pearce, Reverdy Johnson, and Thomas Holliday Hicks, and in the House of Representatives by Charles B. Calvert, John W. Crisfield, John A. J. Creswell, Henry May, Edwin H. Webster, Francis Thomas, Cornelius L. L. Leary, and Benjamin G. Harris. Pearce and Kennedy were both unacceptable as Senators to the most rabid Unionists of Maryland after the war broke out. This group sponsored a resolution, introduced in the State Legislature early in 1862, calling for their resignation. Commenting upon this resolution, the *Frederick Examiner* said that neither represented the wishes or sentiments

of his constituency. "It must occasion" Pearce, said this journal, "a poignant self-reproach, to retain the seat, where his policy is condemned, his acts viewed with suspicion, and his presence regarded as that of a selfish intruder." [1] Kennedy was charged with too strong a Confederate bias, and was said to lack "that uncompromising devotion to the Union, that repugnance to the political heresy of secession . . . that generous support of the Administration which ought to characterize a United States Senator from Maryland." The *Examiner* favored Henry Winter Davis for Senator in case either Pearce or Kennedy resigned as the result of the Legislature's resolutions.

Pearce and Kennedy, however, had no intention of resigning, but in December, 1862, Pearce's severe and apparently fatal illness aroused considerable speculation on his probable successor. Ex-Governor Hicks had many supporters as the logical candidate in case Pearce was unable to continue. Consequently, when Pearce died of heart disease after intense and prolonged suffering on December 20, 1862,[2] Governor Bradford on December 29 appointed Hicks to fill out the unexpired term. Hicks' appointment had been urged by the *Baltimore American*. It declared on December 25 that "we are sure we express the views of the loyal men of the State—and we may add of the Nation when we respectfully suggest for the high office . . . the honored name of Thomas Holliday Hicks." [3] The *Frederick Examiner* was sure that Governor Bradford would "gratify the unanimous loyal sentiment of the State by investing him [Hicks] with the Senatorial toga." [4] In his letter of appointment, Governor Bradford stated that he could make no appointment more pleasing to the loyalists of Maryland. He urged Hicks to use his new position to help suppress the rebellion, and not to allow subordinate issues to interfere with that attempt.[5] Hicks was appointed to serve until the Legislature, scheduled to meet in January, 1864, elected a successor to Pearce whose term ran until 1867.[6] The legislature

[1] January 29, 1862. [2] *Baltimore American*, December 23, 1862.
[3] December 25, 1862. The *Sun* of this date, carried an item from the *Pittsburg Gazette*, copied from a letter in the *New York Post*, saying that Hicks was a candidate for Congress in the First District on a platform advocating emancipation in Maryland and other states. This paper evidently confused his prospective Senatorship with a seat in the House.
[4] December 31, 1862.
[5] Bradford to Hicks, December 29, 1862. Bradford MSS.
[6] *Sun*, December 31, 1862.

in January, 1864, promptly elected Hicks to fill out the term. There was little opposition to him; he was given 67 votes to 18 for Samuel Hambleton and two for Judge Thomas A. Spence, an emancipationist. The *Baltimore American* said Hicks' election should be viewed as a debt of gratitude to him for the " noble stand " he had taken as Governor. At first the *American* had favored Spence, because of his emancipationist views, but since Hicks and other conservative Unionists had accepted the verdict of the Maryland elections in November, 1863, that returned a majority to the legislature in favor of emancipation, the *American* came out in support of Hicks.[7]

Senator Kennedy's term expired on March 3, 1863, and Reverdy Johnson, who had been elected by the State Legislature on March 5, 1862, to succeed him, took over his new duties in December, 1863. Kennedy had not been a candidate for reelection. His conservatism and opposition to the doctrine of implied powers, as interpreted by Lincoln, had made him distasteful to the party in power in Maryland.[8] Johnson was elected by a vote of 56-28. In the caucus of the Union members the contest had been a spirited one between Johnson, William Price, who represented the moderate men; and Henry Winter Davis, who represented the more radical element. Johnson was nominated by one vote. Following this, J. V. L. Findlay attempted unsuccessfully to continue the fight by having Thomas S. Alexander of Cecil County run as an independent candidate.[9] Johnson occupied a prominent position among the people of Maryland and his election was hailed with joy by the Union men. He had been distinguished from the very inception of the struggle and was called the " bulwark of the state against the wild dirges that have threatened her with distruction." [10] It was expected that his unsurpassed talents and great experience would help restore " those relationships between the states which must result once more in giving . . . back a cordial Union." Johnson was called the " truest among the true." [11] The

[7] January 9, 1864; see Baltimore *Sun*, January 9, 1864. The *Baltimore American* said that Hicks' election had also been due partly to the Legislature's detestation of Henry Winter Davis who had been favored by the radical faction.

[8] Radcliffe, *Governor Hicks*, p. 121.

[9] The vote in the joint convention of the two houses was as follows: Reverdy Johnson, 56; Dr. Lynch, 7; Thomas S. Alexander, 4; blank votes, 17. *Sun*, March 5, 1862; B. C. Steiner, *The Life of Reverdy Johnson*, p. 57.

[10] *Baltimore American*, March 7, 1862.

[11] *Ibid.*

Maryland Union of Frederick said that the "wisdom and patriotism of the present Legislature has been fully vindicated in the election of the Hon. Reverdy Johnson." As a man of "extraordinary ability," his election would "reflect much credit upon the State. He has outlived the day of selfish ambition, and his age and position in life, as well as his past political career," would sufficiently guarantee that he would allow only patriotic motives to influence him in the discharge of duties assigned to him.[12]

Reverdy Johnson's reputation preceded him to the Senate. It is doubtful if he had a superior in that body, certainly not on constitutional questions. Johnson was not an extremist, but a conciliator, driven by expediency to take positive positions. He had many conflicts with Charles Sumner. Bernard C. Steiner, his biographer, says that Johnson "invariably worsted" Sumner on constitutional points. "With Fessenden, he sparred on terms of full equality, and . . . Lyman Trumbull of Illinois, was the only senator, who . . . ever came out victor in a conflict with Johnson." [13]

Maryland's delegation in the House of Representatives was for the most part a loyal one. This was true particularly after the November, 1863, elections. At this time John A. J. Creswell replaced John W. Crisfield as the Representative from the First District. The *Frederick Examiner* called this a "real triumph of principle," since the Eastern Shore was predominantly pro-slavery. Crisfield was a Unionist until slavery was interfered with, and except on that issue had satisfied loyalists and was in harmony with the administration. "His defeat is the reprobation of his constituency." [14] Colonel Edwin H. Webster was reelected in the Second District. Although he had given a feeble and lukewarm support to the Administration in the first session of the Thirty-seventh Congress, he subsequently became an Unconditional

[12] March 6, 1862. [13] *The Life of Reverdy Johnson*, p. 62.

[14] November 18, 1863. Creswell was a staunch Unionist from the beginning of the war. See his letter to Andrew McIntire, June 12, 1861. Creswell MSS (Library of Congress, I, # 34). He was elected to the House of Delegates in 1861, and in 1862 was chosen acting adjutant-general of Maryland. In the House of Representatives he served on the committees on Commerce and Invalid Pensions. He was delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1864, and was elected in 1864 to succeed Hicks in the United States Senate. *Portrait and Biographical Record of Harford and Cecil Counties, Maryland*, p. 121; *Dictionary of American Biography*, IV, 541-542.

Unionist and gave proof of his loyalty by his military service in the field. "His approved loyalty and devotion to the cause of the country are an ample guaranty for his future course." [15] In the Third District, Henry Winter Davis succeeded Henry May, who, by representing his position to be a loyal one, had defeated Davis in June, 1861. Davis represented the very acme of Unionism in Maryland. He was the most outspoken of the Maryland delegation in the House, using to full advantage his oratorical abilities and wide range of knowledge to uphold the Union cause. His career had been meteoric. In the House he was considered one of the most dangerous debaters. James G. Blaine said that had Davis been blessed with length of days he would have "left the most splendid name in the parliamentary annals of America." [16] He was as passionate an advocate of civil liberties as Reverdy Johnson. He had opposed secession but was bitter in his denunciation of the tyranny of militarism and the abuse of power by which he considered an autocratic regime had been created. Before the end of 1864, however, Davis went over to the Radical Republicans and attacked Lincoln violently on his restoration policies. He was joint author of both the Wade-Davis Bill and the Wade Davis Manifesto. His position on these policies will not be considered here, however, since they properly belong to a study of Reconstruction.

Francis Thomas, incumbent, was returned to Congress from the Fourth District. He had become, by 1864, an Unconditional Unionist. But here the list of Unconditional Unionists ended, for in the Fifth District, Benjamin G. Harris, Democrat, had taken advantage of the split in the Union ranks and defeated John G. Holland, Unconditional Unionist, and Charles B. Calvert, conservative or conditional Unionist.[17]

Various aspects of slavery and emancipation occupied the Maryland delegation in Congress more fully than any other problem that concerned the State. Nearly every important speech made by a Marylander dealt in whole or in part with slavery or emanci-

[15] *Frederick Examiner*, November 18, 1863.

[16] Jesse Frederick Essary, *Maryland in National Politics*, pp. 202-203. Davis first served in the House of Representatives in 1855, and except from 1861 to 1863 he served until his premature death in December, 1865.

[17] *Frederick Examiner*, November 18, 1863. See *Baltimore Clipper*, June 3, 1863 for Calvert's nomination, and the *Sun*, July 15 and October 10, 1863, for his platform. For Harris's platform, see the *Sun*, October 10, 1863, and *Baltimore Daily Gazette*, October 17, 1863.

pation and its effects on Maryland. On January 2, 1862, Senator Kennedy presented a resolution passed by the Maryland legislature that urged the Administration to prosecute the war "with but one object; that, namely, of a restoration of the Union just as it was when the rebellion broke out."

> [Lincoln should] resist and rebuke all attempts, from any and every quarter, to convert this war into a crusade against the institution of domestic slavery as it exists in the southern States, under the guarantees of the Constitution, or to take advantage of the troubled condition of our country for the gratification of personal views or sectional prejudices.[18]

An identical resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 8 by Charles B. Calvert.[19]

Senator Pearce, on January 14, 1862, criticized the District of Columbia Provost Marshal for dismissing runaway slaves from the District jail. He said he believed "an act of emancipation, even a partial one, passed by Congress at this time, would be greatly injurious to interests which all you here I hope have at heart. You cannot expect success in restoring the Union, if it be known that your policy is one of emancipation." Pearce said he was reluctant to speak on the subject of domestic slavery. "During a service of some twenty-five or twenty-six years in Congress," he said, "I have made it a point to abstain from all such discussions, thinking them unprofitable and mischievous and I have never contributed by word of mine, to the agitation of that question here."[20] Two days later Pearce spoke in favor of an amendment to a bill which, in his language, "forbade officers and soldiers of the Army from entering, harboring, or preventing the recovery—that is the amount of it—of a fugitive slave, known to be such, upon the application of his master, known to be his lawful owner according to the laws of the state in which he lives."[21] This bill, said Pearce, would prevent many loyal Marylanders from losing slave property. Throughout the war the problem of runaway slaves continued to harass slaveholders in the State, and the situation became acute after the slaves were emancipated in the District of Columbia and after Lincoln's January, 1863, Proclamation of Emancipation. Representative Benjamin G. Harris said on March 21, 1864, that he would like

[18] *Congressional Globe*, 2nd Sess., 37th Cong., Pt. 1, p. 182.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 228.
[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 312-313, 315.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 359.

" to know who furnishes transportation for the slave women and children stolen from St. Mary's County, Maryland. . . . Some of my constituents have been robbed of all their servants. I myself have been a great sufferer." He thought that an Administration " which would sanction such a robbery would be guilty of anything. . . . " [22]

Every Maryland Representative, except Edwin H. Webster who was called home suddenly, voted against Roscoe Conkling's motion, on March 10, 1862, to suspend the rules so he could introduce a joint resolution prepared by President Lincoln in which he proposed aid to any state adopting gradual abolition of slavery. But the rules were suspended by a vote of 86 to 35, and the resolution was introduced. Crisfield said that he favored a postponement of its consideration. Under ordinary circumstances, he said, Maryland would be opposed to the measure, and therefore he desired that his constituents be given an opportunity to express themselves on it. Since he represented a slaveholding Eastern Shore District, he felt sure there was opposition to Lincoln's plan in that region.[23] When the vote was taken, Representatives Crisfield, Leary, and Thomas voted against Lincoln's proposal, and on the following day Calvert recorded his vote similarly. Henry May and Edwin H. Webster did not vote.

Senator Kennedy represented the views of many in Maryland when he spoke out vociferously on March 25, 1862, in opposition to the bill to emancipate slaves in the District of Columbia. He quoted from Governor Bradford's inaugural address of January, 1862, in which the latter urged that slavery be excluded from the war issues. Kennedy then said of slavery in Maryland:

> Slavery, in my judgment, is a doomed institution in Maryland, doomed by the irreversible laws of political economy, and further affected by causes arising out of the rebellion, and it needs no unnecessary stimulant to accelerate its decline: but, at the same time, it is surrounded by circumstances which will not admit of interference with the question in this District without producing the most disastrous consequences to the resources and social organization of the State, but most especially to the free negroes themselves. . . .
>
> Slavery abolished in this District, and laws passed against the recovery of absconding slaves, the decrease would be repaid in Maryland, while the free negroes would remain: and from the natural increase alone we would find in a few years one sixth of our whole population of this class,

[22] *Ibid.*, Pt. 2, p. 1221.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 1151, 1169-1170.

to say nothing of the great injustice to the people of this District which would result from the immense increase of fugitive negroes here by the passage of this bill.[24]

Kennedy pointed out other ways in which he thought the bill would be injurious to Maryland if passed. He could not avoid speaking warmly on the subject when he considered the "bitter antipathy between the laboring white people and the free blacks," and he spoke as one who had employed both classes. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, Kennedy presented a petition to the Senate on April 3, signed by 169 citizens of Maryland, protesting against the bill to free District slaves. The petitioners charged that their slaves had escaped to the District and been protected there by government officers. They demanded, therefore, that the Fugitive Slave Law be enforced, or "so amended as to secure to them the safe recovery of such slaves as may escape." [25]

When the bill to emancipate slaves in the District was taken up in the House on April 10, Edwin H. Webster moved that it be "laid aside." Calvert, May, and Thomas voted against the bill while Leary, Crisfield, and Webster failed to vote. A Baltimore correspondent to the *New York Post* said of this situation:

> This means more than meets the eye. These gentlemen have shown a clear appreciation of the future on the subject of slavery in this State. They see that it is speedily doomed, and they have rightly refused to let their voices be heard against the extinction of the curse in the national capital. Mr. Crisfield has 100 slaves and represents the lower district on the Eastern Shore, and he is now in a position to lead the rising anti-slavery hosts that are already beginning to stir in our State. This is also true of Messrs. Webster and Leary, though I believe they are not large slaveholders.
>
> The vote of May and Calvert does not surprise anyone. It would have been a miracle for either of these persons to vote for liberty to the slave anywhere; but the vote of . . . Thomas against the bill grieves and shames his republican friends in the State. His bold and manly stand against the rebel cause and its cornerstone, slavery, . . . last fall, just one year after the republicans were mobbed in the same house by the very men who applauded him to the skies, had won for him the heart of every anti-slavery man in Maryland . . . but shortly after Congress met in December [1861] he began to waver . . . was found voting with the pro-slavery side of the House on every question that looked to the real supression of the Rebellion, and he has now enrolled his name among the

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 1353-1356.

[25] *Ibid.*, Pt. 3, p. 2274.

thirty-nine upholders of slavery at the capital of the republic . . . Western Maryland, anti-slavery by instinct and interest, will have to look for some other leader in the coming election between slavery and freedom.[26]

Crisfield, the most active of the Maryland Representatives in 1862, protested vigorously on March 25 against a proposed tax of $5 a head on slaves. He asserted that such a tax in Maryland, where there were approximately 90,000 slaves, would compel the State to pay more than her portion of the direct tax imposed at the last session of Congress. With other taxes levied upon her, Maryland would be paying much out of proportion to her just quota. "This proposition," said Crisfield, "is not for the purpose of raising revenue but for the purpose of striking at an institution which we cherish." Maryland was willing to pay her share of the direct tax, and even prepared to have that tax doubled, yet

loyal as we are, and have been, here is this proposition to strike at our interests and to tax us double what other states are taxed. I protest against it in the name of Maryland's loyalty. I protest against it in the name of our oppressed people. I hope that the House will not put us to too severe a test.[27]

When the debate on the tax bill was resumed on April 4, Charles B. Calvert unsuccessfully proposed an amendment which would allow a tax on slaves under this condition: "*Provided*, however, That this Government shall pay the owners of such slaves as have escaped, or shall escape, through the action of this House and a portion of the Army, the sum of $1,000 for every slave so escaping." [28]

When the bill, proposing to abolish slavery in "all places in the States, purchased and ceded to the United States, for the erection of forts, magazines, dock-yards, and other needful buildings, on every vessel on the high seas, and on national highways out of the States, from which and to which they are going," came before the House, Crisfield spoke in opposition. He said the bill would work to the detriment of the institution of slavery in Maryland. He pointed to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, the grounds of which Maryland had ceded to the United States, and said it would become an asylum to which Maryland's slaves might escape, and

[26] Reprinted in the Baltimore *Sun*, April 18, 1862, and in the *Maryland Union* (Frederick), April 24, 1862.
[27] *Congressional Globe*, 2nd Sess., 37th Cong., Pt. 2, p. 1867 (March 25, 1862).
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 1549.

their " just owners " would be " defrauded of their just rights." Crisfield asked: " Do you believe the people of fifteen States are going to stand for this policy? . . . ought to stand for it? " He said it was their right to decide whether they should have slavery within their borders, and denounced the bill as a " palpable violation of the rights of States, and an unwarrantable interference with the rights of private property . . . a fraud upon the States which have made cessions of land to this government. . . . " [29]

On May 14 Crisfield spoke on the provision of the army appropriation bill that provided for the confiscation of rebel property and the liberation of slaves. He denied that Congress had power to confiscate such property, and stated that even if Congress had been given such power it would be highly dangerous and inexpedient to exercise it. " The Constitution forbids the absolute forfeiture of the personal estates of the traitor," he said. Crisfield maintained that slavery was

> not the cause of this rebellion. It is simply the instrument by which it is carried on. It seeks an aggrandizement for itself or degradation of free labor. It is content with the enjoyment of its rights as defined by the Constitution. But great crimes are committed in its name and guilty ambition seeks to conceal its purpose under the folds of its garment.[30]

Crisfield warned against confiscation and all other " ultra measures. They only aggravate and intensify passions and prejudices which pervade the country." He felt that real peace would result only from respecting the Constitution and waging the war for its principles. " Then will you have demonstrated before a doubting world, in favor of the dignity of human nature the great problem of man's capacity to govern himself." [31]

On December 19, 1862, Crisfield delivered a speech on " The Rebellion and the Proclamation." He said that the " insurrection stands without justification in law or morals. It is a rebellion, not against usurpation, not to resist oppression, not to redress grievances, but to overthrow and destroy the government itself." Yet the war had been turned into one for abolition, straying from the original object of suppressing the rebellion. Crisfield cited the Proclamation of Emancipation recently issued by Lincoln, in support of his views. He called upon the Border states to oppose such a policy because the slave-owners would not be compensated

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 2049. [30] *Ibid.*, p. 2133. [31] *Ibid.*, p. 2134.

and the slaves would suffer in their sudden emancipation. Furthermore, said Crisfield, slaves were private property and therefore could not be emancipated without confiscation.[32]

On January 12, 1863, Francis Thomas offered a resolution instructing the committee on emancipation and colonization to aid Maryland in the colonization of her slaves.[33] On the same day, Henry May proposed a resolution looking toward the return of fugitive slaves to Maryland. May's resolution was laid upon the table and he immediately introduced a second one objecting to the military interference with the institution of slavery in Maryland, but this was also rejected.[34] May persisted and on January 29 introduced resolutions expressing Maryland's grievances. Once again he was not heard.[35] But on February 2, Crisfield successfully pleaded for May, saying "He has not occupied the floor for one hour nor for one moment, I believe, during the present session. I make it a personal request to the gentleman to allow him to be heard now." May then spoke for half an hour against the measure to arm Negroes, for use in the military force. He said the measure was "simply preposterous" as a "manifestation of military strength," and "eminently disgraceful" as an evidence of national policy. May said the Negro, with his "amiable disposition, inert nature, slovenly habits, clumsiness, want of vigilance" was unfit for military service. He also protested against the war and coercion; he favored peace and compromise. He thought that a political union of the North and South would never exist again, and that a commercial union was all that was left. "Separation, *Recognition*, disolving finally all political and moral relations with the non-slaveholding States now offers the healing balm to the wounded breast of the political abolitionist." May then proposed resolutions providing for peace commissioners who were to compromise the war issues or arrange for a peaceful separation of North and South.[36]

When the bill providing for Negro enlistments came before the House for a vote, every Maryland Representative present, Crisfield, Leary, Thomas, and Calvert, voted against it.[37] Webster later expressed his opposition in a speech on February 28. He

[32] *Congressional Globe*, 3rd Sess., 37th Cong., Pt. 1, pp. 147, 149, 150-151.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 283.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 382.
[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 685-688.
[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 699, 695.

said " that if the time ever arrives when the free white men of this country are not equal to the duty of preserving the Union, the institutions of liberty within it, and their own inestimable rights, it is folly, it is shame to imagine that this can be done by the enslaved and degraded negro." [38] Webster also protested against the introduction of the Negro question, in any form, into the prosecution of the war. " You must crush the armed forces of the rebellion. This is the only road to a permanent peace and a reconstructed Union. Truces, armistices, compromises, concessions, and conventions at this time will avail you nothing." [39]

Albert S. White of Indiana introduced a bill on February 25, 1863, from the select committee on emancipation, to give aid to Maryland in abolishing slavery. Crisfield of Maryland objected at once. He said it did not provide for compensation in a satisfactory manner but provided only for an indefinite appropriation, and that Maryland had not asked for it.[40]

The enrollment bill took much of Reverdy Johnson's time in January, 1864. He insisted that owners be compensated for all Negroes enlisted in the Federal service. He voted on January 28 in favor of freeing slaves after they were enrolled, but said he opposed giving freedom to the slave's wife, mother, or children unless the owner were compensated.[41] Johnson complained on February 13 of the manner in which slaves were enlisted in Maryland. He repeated several stories of illegal seizures in which owners had not been given an opportunity to identify their slaves for future compensation. He admitted that a " prosperous and permanent peace can never be secured, if the institution [slavery] is allowed to survive," but he insisted upon constitutional measures in abolishing it. He thus favored the Thirteenth Amendment, although he said Congress had no power to destroy slavery in loyal states. But it was necessary to destroy slavery, said Johnson, in order to end the war.[42]

In February, 1864, Thaddeus Stevens proposed that compensation of $300 be given to slave owners for each slave enlisted in the army. Creswell opposed the payment of $300 to the owners whose slaves were drafted. He maintained that the non-

[38] Pt. 2, p. 1425. [39] *Ibid.*, p. 1426. [40] *Ibid.*, p. 1426.
[41] *Ibid.*, 1st Sess., 38th Cong., Pt. 1, pp. 161, 200-201, 221, 226-227, 231-232; *Baltimore American*, January 12, 1864.
[42] *Ibid.*, pp. 633-634, 822, 841-842; Pt. 2, pp. 1419-1424.

slaveholders had supported the Union by military service while slaveholders had paid commutations to escape service. Henry Winter Davis agreed with Creswell, but soon changed his mind, for on the following day he proposed that the Secretary of War appoint a commission in each slave state represented in Congress that would award a just compensation to loyal slave owners whose slaves volunteered. Davis asserted that he still opposed the principle, and did not approve compensation for owners whose slaves were drafted without their consent.[43] Webster of Maryland argued that drafted and volunteer slaves should be placed on the same footing. Regardless of the owners' consent, he said, slaves were " private property taken for public use." Webster would have the slaves freed after their military service ended. The real question, he said, was not the " *right* to take slaves for military service, but the *expediency* of so doing." [44] The position taken by Webster and Davis called Benjamin G. Harris to the floor. He credited Stevens with a " sense of justice " despite his abolitionist views, since he favored compensating owners. Davis and Webster on the other hand would starve Maryland slaveholders. Harris said he believed the Supreme Court would uphold him in his contention that Congress had no right to enlist a slave. It was a " degradation " to the nation and the flag to call upon Negroes to defend it.[45] Creswell drew laughter when he replied that he was willing to let the " tender mercies and grim justice " of Thaddeus Stevens decide the slave questions of Maryland.[46] Davis denied Harris's assumption that slaves would be recognized as property by the Supreme Court in its interpretation of the Constitution. " He is property, not by law of the United States, but by the laws of the respective States. The Constitution of the United States treats him as a person." [47]

Thomas H. Hicks, who took his seat in the Senate following Pearce's death in December, 1862, made few speeches because of his feeble health. On June 13, 1864, he spoke while sitting in his chair,[48] expressing himself in favor of the reelection of Lincoln. He urged that squabbles over party leadership be ended, the rebellion be crushed, and emancipation accomplished.

[43] *Ibid.*, Pt. 1, pp. 597-598.
[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 597-598.
[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 597-598.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 600.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 603.
[48] Hicks had just had one of his legs amputated.

A few days later Hicks said he did not know which would be the "greater calamity, the success of the rebellion or the resurrection of the Democratic party." He feared that a continual discussion of the Negro in the Senate would work in the Democrats' favor.[49] Despite Hick's conversion to emancipation, he was opposed to the proposed act for a "Freedmen's Bureau" because he believed it would place the Negro in an actual, if disguised, form of servitude by putting him under "overseers and slavedrivers." [50]

When Congress assembled in December, 1864, it was evident that the fall of the Confederacy was close at hand, and the measures discussed and passed by this session had little direct bearing upon Maryland. Reverdy Johnson, however, found many things to discuss. On January 9, Senator Benjamin F. Wade said that the war should be continued for thirty years, if necessary to completely abolish slavery. Johnson replied: "I dislike the institution just as much as he does or can." But Johnson would terminate the war at once, believing that in "the retributive justice of heaven, the institution is mortally wounded now." The South, said Johnson, "must have seen what an element of weakness it is in war." He did not believe that the abolition of slavery, by constitutional enactment, would be an impediment to a successful peace, but did think that such a step would "tend to strengthen the government and greatly increase the chances of an early restoration of the Union." [51]

Creswell introduced a resolution on February 1, 1865, directing Secretary of War Stanton to report to the House of Representatives what compensation, if any, had been awarded to each of the several slave states represented in Congress for distribution to loyal owners of enlisted slaves. If such compensation had not been made, Creswell would have the Secretary state why it had not, since an act of Congress of February 24, 1864, had provided for it.[52]

Members of the Maryland delegation were quick throughout the war to rush to the defense of Maryland when her loyalty was questioned. On March 10, 1862, when John Hickman of Pennsylvania asserted that Maryland had been held in the Union only

[49] *Congressional Globe*, 1st Sess., 38th Cong., Pt. 4, p. 3263.
[50] *Ibid.*, Pt. 4, p. 3336 (June 28).
[51] *Ibid.*, 2nd Sess., 38th Cong., Pt. 1, pp. 313-315.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 539.

by a fear of war, Edwin H. Webster pointed to the large Union majorities at each Maryland election since the war began, and maintained that the State desired to preserve the Union and prosecute the war. Hickman persisted, however, in saying that Maryland had "been chained to the car of the Union simply because she was unable very readily to separate herself from it." At this point Crisfield came to Webster's aid. He was surprised that Hickman could be so unfamiliar with "the public acts of the people of Maryland." Hickman retorted that he would like to be made familiar with such acts, and Crisfield obliged by enumerating three. "In the first place, there is the governor of Maryland, to whose agency more than that of any other human being, are we indebted to-day for the possession of this capital." He then listed the June, 1861, Congressional elections in Maryland, calling it the "severest contest that had ever occurred in the State of Maryland," and noted that it returned a unanimous Union representation for the State. Thirdly, Crisfield named the election of November, 1861, saying that it expressed Maryland's devotion to the Union by a vote of more than two to one.[53] These proofs of Maryland's loyalty did not satisfy the persistent Hickman. He stated that he agreed with President Lincoln who must have been convinced of Maryland's disloyalty when he sanctioned the arrest of members of the State Legislature in September, 1861. Francis Thomas resented the unfairness of Hickman in holding all Maryland responsible for the threatened action of a few members of the Legislature who had been elected to their posts two years before their arrest. Thomas pointed to the loyal Legislature then representing the people of Maryland. Hickman, however, put in the last word, using Jefferson Davis as authority for the assertion that, if Maryland had not been intimidated and held by force, the State would have linked her fortunes with the South.

Crisfield again spoke of Maryland's loyalty when the bill to tax owners for each slave was under discussion on March 25. But he stated that even though Maryland was strongly loyal she might yet be "goaded into exasperation." Crisfield's speech aroused violent protest on the part of Representative Owen Lovejoy of Illinois. He said he was tired of hearing repeatedly that

[53] *Congressional Globe*, 2nd Sess., 37th Cong., Pt. 2, pp. 1176-1177. Crisfield, in naming the second proof of Maryland's loyalty, included Henry May as a Union Representative, which did not turn out to be the case.

Maryland was loyal. "Loyal! What if you are? It is your duty. It is no more for Maryland to be loyal than it is for Illinois to be loyal." Lovejoy asserted that because the State still recognized slavery—"a system of robbery; a system of rapine and outrage, which the civilization of the world has got tired of; which is a stench in the nostrils of God, and which the whole universe is clamoring to have done away"—it found it hard to be loyal. "And when you come to the bottom of it," he continued, "it is God's truth that they love this system more than they do the Union; and when it comes to the pinch, many will go with the secessionists." [54]

Crisfield said that Lovejoy knew nothing "about which he talks." He then added that the troubles of the country had been brought about by two classes of people: those in the ranks of the rebellion and those "as mischievous and equally as detestable . . . found in the North constantly agitating and disturbing the harmony and peace of the country, and of this class the member from Illinois [Lovejoy] is a prominent and leading member." Crisfield said it would be an act of cruelty to emancipate the slaves at that time. "The choice . . . is between slavery on the one hand, and degradation, poverty, suffering, and ultimate extinction on the other." Speaking as a slaveholder, he continued:

> . . . Provide the means by which I can be remunerated for raising these slaves; provide the means adequate for their removal, and satisfy me that their condition will be bettered, and I say today that mine, at least—and I believe I speak the general sentiment of Maryland—may all go to that happier condition, and I shall rejoice that an asylum has been found for them. . . . Sir, emancipation, without such removal and such provision, is an act of inhumanity.[55]

Crisfield rapped at Lovejoy when he added: "But I hold that the man who stands up here day after day, and year after year, using his powerful talents to disturb the peace and harmony of the country, is as disloyal as the man who draws the sword to strike down the Constitution." Lovejoy replied that this was "abuse," but that he did not mind it much, for when a person "is hard pushed for argument, he usually takes to abuse." He denied that his class of men, as Crisfield had charged, was equally guilty with the rebels in bringing on the conflict. "Sir," closed Lovejoy, "it is not I, but slavery." [56]

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 1367. [55] *Ibid.*, p. 1368. [56] *Ibid.*, 1368.

On June 9, 1862, Webster analyzed the political situation in Maryland as follows:

> . . . Two parties only are found there [Maryland] now—the friends of the Union and the enemies of the Union; the men who stand for the protection of the government, for the upholding of its flag; and for the enforcement of its laws, and the men who desire to see those laws set at defiance, that flag trampled in the dust, and that government broken in pieces. . . .
>
> Why, sir, look at the delegation from my State on this floor and see how old party lines have ceased to exist. At the last presidential election my friend who sits in front of me (Mr. Crisfield) voted for Breckinridge. My colleagues, the one who sits immediately in front of me (Mr. Calvert) and the one who sits behind me (Mr. Leary), and myself voted for Bell. My other colleagues (Mr. Thomas and Mr. May) voted for Douglas. The people of the State, when they came to send a delegation to Congress, selected men from all the old parties, and sent them here to deliberate and determine not for party, but for that which is higher and holier than party, their country.[57]

Webster closed his speech, as nearly every Marylander did, by urging Congress not to interfere with the institution of slavery in the State, and to prosecute the war on a basis of suppressing the Rebellion and restoring the Union.

(*To be continued.*)

[57] *Ibid.*, Pt. 3, p. 2215.

GOVERNOR CHARLES GOLDSBOROUGH'S VIEWS ON SLAVERY

The concern felt by a former governor of Maryland for the well-being of his numerous Negro slaves is described in a letter owned by Mrs. William D. Gould of Easton, Maryland, great granddaughter of the writer.[1] From "Ravensworth," Fairfax County, Va., the home of his daughter, Mrs. William H. Fitzhugh, Governor Charles Goldsborough makes inquiries of a friend in Mississippi regarding lands on which a colony of his slaves might be transplanted. The letter is addressed to Dr. Sulivane, a native of Dorchester County, Md., who had removed to the South. Governor Goldsborough did not live to fulfill either plan mentioned in his letter. He died on December 13, 1834, in his 70th year, after serving in the House of Representatives from 1805 to 1817, and as Governor of Maryland 1818-1819.

Doctor Vans M. Sulivane[2]
Grand Gulf
State of Mississippi

Ravensworth, August 28th, 1834

Dear Sir,

I was very much gratified a few days ago, by receiving your obliging and friendly letter of the 24th of July. Having left home a short time before its arrival at Cambridge on my annual visit to my daughter, it was then remailed to Alex., and at last got to my hands on Friday last, the 22nd Inst. The first and most ample source of the gratification it afforded me was in the very flattering account it gave of your own situation and professional prosperity. I sincerely hope that this may be realized to the utmost extent of your expectations and wishes, and that you will have it

[1] Copy of the letter has kindly been furnished by Miss Charlotte Fletcher, daughter of Mrs. Gould, who is assistant librarian at St. John's College.

[2] Dr. Sulivane (1810-1840) was a son of Dr. James B. Sulivane, graduated from the University of Maryland in 1830, and went to Mississippi in 1833. He met a violent death from stabbing in 1840.

in your power, in a few years, to return to the place of your nativity, if you so choose, and to the society of your friends in the enjoyment of the health with which you left them, and in possession of as much wealth as will satisfy your desires and even your ambitions.

The account you were so obliging as to give me of the state of the Country to which you have emigrated, and the prospects it affords to persons encumbered here with too much of a certain description of property, which to me has been a source of vexation throughout my whole life, is very satisfactory as far as it goes. If you had added some information respecting the prices of lands in that part of the country and the facility of purchasing settlements either improved or unimproved, your communication would have embraced all that I wish to know. I find it impossible without great loss both of money and comfort to continue my establishment upon its present footing. The number I have to support (and if I keep them at all I must keep them well) consume all that they make, and notwithstanding all my kind treatment of them, every now and then one of my best men runs away from me and I have his wife and children upon me to support. I can see but two remedies for these evils; namely, either to convert the whole of them into money by a sale to whom will give the best price for them or to send out as my own property a sufficient number to stock a good large cotton plantation, and to purchase land to settle them on. The objections to the former one, that, conduct the transaction in the gentlest manner you can, it is inevitably to a certain degree inhuman and offensive to one's own feelings. It can not be effected without violence, and without handcuffs and chains; and besides, you can not sell them here to any buyer for his own use for more than half or two-thirds of their worth. The latter involves no violation of humanity. Remaining the property of their present master, there is no possible severance of connections and they are sure of being as well treated as they ever were. To them the removing is just the same as the migration of any poor white family seeking their future in the southern or western country. I am, therefore, very much inclined to adopt the latter plan.

I recollect Judge Perkins very well. He was over at Shoal Creek [3] and appeared to be a gentlemanly and intelligent man. If I knew his address, that is, his Christian name and the exact place of his abode, I would write to him. If you should meet with him, be good enough to ask him to favor me with a letter describing exactly the size and situation and state of improvement of the plantation, to which his proposition communicated through you, had reference, and the quality and condition of the land. As to the offer to purchase here made by another Gentleman, whose name I cannot recollect, for your letter is now in the hands of my son Wm. at Shoal Creek, it comes nearly up to the price at which I should be willing to sell, if I sold at all; and if he were here perhaps there might be no great difficulty in our agreeing for the number he wants, if he would agree to some little extension as to ages. If I sell at all it must be in whole families. But I cannot undertake to hunt after his agent; and I should

[3] Plantation in Dorchester County on which the Governor made his home.

prefer negotiating with Principals. There is one piece of information I wish to obtain. If I were to send out 40 or 50 to Grand Gulf or to Natchez, how and with what expense could one manage to provide a temporary domicile for them and to keep them in comfort and with good treatment, until a more permanent settlement of them could be made. If you should get an inclination at some moment of leisure to do me the favor to write again you will oblige me by adverting to that difficulty, which I suppose to be a very probable one.

I am sorry that it is not in my power to give you any particular information respecting your friends at Cambridge, having been from home nearly four weeks. The accounts I have received from Wm. are that county is not sickly. When you left us, as I recollect, you spoke of making a visit to Cambridge in the spring. I hope it will be in your power to do so, and to gratify your numerous friends with some weeks of your society.

Believe me to be, Dear Sir,

with much esteem and respect,

Very sincerely yours,

C. Goldsborough

AMONG THE "MEETERS AT THE BAYSIDE"

By Emerson B. Roberts

The site of the first Quaker Meeting in Talbot is near the present villages of McDaniel and Wittman. The land was given for the purpose about 1667 by Robert Kemp, a young Quaker recently come to Bayside, as this locality was then called. Today the remains of the burying ground is at the left of the road as one goes from McDaniel to Wittman and on the other side, not far away, are two brown frame houses built in part from lumber thought to have been taken from the old Bayside Meeting House. The land is adjacent to "Boulton," more frequently called "The Quaker Kemp Farm."

Betty's Cove Meeting, visited by George Fox in 1672 and again in 1673, is located on the farm known as "North Bend" owned by James Dixon. The Meeting House was finished or remodeled about 1676 and continued in regular use until about 1693, when the Meeting there was removed to "ye great Meeting House" at Third Haven. Betty's Cove Meeting House, however, was kept in repair, and fences and graveyard kept up for some time.

Long after the death of John Kemp IV, great-great-grandson of Robert, his widow, Sarah, more than a century after the abandonment of these Bayside Meeting Houses, except by the encircling dead, with her children frequently would *sit meeting* alone. From first to last, the Kemps were among the "meeters at the Bayside," to use the phrase current two centuries ago.

It is of those early Kemps, six generations of whom lie in the graveyard, and of the families of Bayside, with whom they were so repeatedly related by ties of blood and of spirit, that we write.

Anciently the name Kemp is of county Norfolk, and from Golfred Kemp of Gissing, who lived in Norwich, 1272. Robert

Kemp is in the Assize Rolls of 1306. The Norfolk family furnished John Kemp, LL. D., Archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Kemp, nephew of His Grace, the Archbishop, who was consecrated Bishop of London in 1449. Oddly enough, the name of this Quaker family in Saxon means "combat," and in parts of England to this day a football match is a "kemping," and a "kemper" a contestant, a *combatant*, a *champion*.

The Maryland Kemps begin with Robert, who gave the land. He was born in Yorkshire 1650, or earlier, and died in Maryland 1702. As a youth, he was in Talbot by 1664, and perhaps before that for some time in Calvert. He declared his intentions toward Elizabeth Webb in 1678, but was admonished to wait until the General Meeting. (Third Haven Records, Vol. I.) This, he did, and in due time married Elizabeth, daughter of Edmund and Elizabeth Webb, the immigrant ancestors of the Webb family.

Robert Kemp died in Talbot in November, 1702. His will (Will Book, Hall of Records, Annapolis, Vol. II, f. 394. Baldwin, *Calendar of Maryland Wills*, III, f. 11. Accounts, Land Office, 1704, Vol. III, f. 370) drawn November 6, was probated November 24 in that year. By it he left the Society of Friends certain personalty. To his son, John, he left a tract of land, "Woolf's Harbour" and lands bought from William Fuller and Robert Clark, and also "Boulton" and "Boulton Addition," situated on the bay shore opposite Poplar Island, "given his mother by her father, Edmund Webb." (Chancery Proceedings, P. C. f. 371, the deposition of George Collison of Talbot, 1696. Also see Kemp pedigree in *Society of Colonial Wars in . . . Maryland, Genealogies of the Members* (1905), p. 75.) In later years "Boulton" became known as "The Quaker Kemp Farm." Yet remembered is the old windmill for the grinding of meal and coffee that stood at the end of the long lane.

The widow, Elizabeth, outlived her husband by about nine years. She died between the 29th of the 6th month and the first of the 9th month, 1711. (Third Haven Records, Vol. II, p. 69.) The children of Robert and Elizabeth Kemp were:

John Kemp, later known as John Kemp I. He was the first of a name that has continued to the present. He was born in 1681 (Chancery Depositions, P. C., 757), and died intestate, 1751. He married November 15, 1705, Mary

Ball, daughter of Lieutenant Thomas Ball and his wife, Susannah.

Edmund received under his father's will, equally with William, " Mable " and " Mable's Addition."

William, " joyner, of St. Michael's Parish," married July 5, 1717, Martha Eubank. His will (Baldwin, *Calendar*, VI, 138), probated November 14, 1729, mentions a son, William, who is to have 223 acres, " Mable Enlarged." Then he mentions his daughters Elizabeth, the eldest, and Rachel, Martha, Jane and Constant. The widow survived.

Elizabeth, born May 20, 1683, baptized September 19, 1702 (St. Michael's Parish), married, " outside the good order," George Collison. The ceremony was performed by the Rev. Mr. Lillington of St. John's Parish, then in Talbot. Elizabeth's father spoke of the reverend gentleman wrathfully as a " priest " for failing to heed the warnings of the Quakers not to perform the ceremony. For her disobedience, Elizabeth, then not eighteen years of age, was disowned by the meeting, though her mother had no part in the action. Her father, unforgiving to the last, cut her off with one shilling under his will, and " bade her be content with her own disobedience in lieu of worldly goods."

Jane, married, first, Robert Clothier, and second, after November, 1702, Thomas Eubank. She, too, was cut off by her father with a shilling.

Rachel and Sarah.

From John Kemp I and his wife, Mary Ball, descends the Kemp family of prominence in Talbot and throughout the State. The administration of his estate, May 20, 1752, by his widow, Mary, and son, John, yields much information of the family in this generation. (Hall of Records, Accounts, 32, f. 329.)

John Kemp II, died 1773, married 1734, Magdaline Stevens, daughter of John and Elizabeth Stevens. John and Magdaline Kemp are distinguished in Talbot and in Maryland in that, voluntarily, and long before it became somewhat common practice even among Quakers, they freed their slaves.

Thomas, mentioned in his grandfather Ball's will as inheriting the lower part of "Long Neck" at his mother's death, and the upper part of the same tract at his father's death.

James, married at Tuckahoe Meeting, June 24, 1749, Elizabeth Harwood, daughter of Peter Harwood, Jr., and widow of William Williams. James and Elizabeth Kemp, "late Elizabeth Williams" rendered accounting on the estate of William Williams of Talbot June 14, 1751. (Accounts 30, f. 132). The representatives of the deceased were "James and Elizabeth Kemp, his wife, Quakers, and children of the deceased, Mary, Rachel, Ennion, and Elizabeth Williams." On the 31st of the 1st month, 1788, James Kemp asked the Meeting to receive his own children, James, Samuel, Robert and Elizabeth. (Third Haven Records.)

Benjamin

Joseph

Elizabeth, married her cousin, James Ball.

Susannah, married, first, John Stewart, and second, September 7, 1744, Peter Harwood, Jr. (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXXVII, p. 320-326.)

Rachel

The family of John Kemp II and Magdaline Stevens, his wife, were:

Mary, born 31st of the 7th month, 1735, died in infancy.

John Kemp III, born 30th of the 5th month, 1737 at "Boulton," died April 7, 1790, married April 7, 1763, Mary Wrightson, daughter of Francis Wrightson and his wife, Elinor Blake, daughter of Peter Blake, the immigrant. John Kemp was a sea captain, active in the Revolution, in transporting troops and supplies. (*S. A. R. Magazine*, April, 1933, p. 347.)

Elizabeth, born 6th of the 7th month, 1739, married John Dixon, Quaker. In the declaration of their intention, 31st of the 1st month, 1757, she is called "Elizabeth Kemp, the younger." Then on the 28th of the 2nd month, 1757, "John Dixon and Elizabeth Kemp the youngest" appeared in Meeting and declared their intentions of marriage, this being the second time of their so appearing, and they ap-

pearing clear of all others, are left to their liberty to accomplish their said intentions as the Truth Directs, making the same public and James Ratcliffe and William Troth are appointed to see the marriage accomplished in Good Order, and to make a report thereon at the next Monthly Meeting . . . 28th of the 3rd month, 1757, the Friends appointed to see the marriage of John Dixon and Elizabeth Kemp accomplished, report that it was accomplished in Good Order. (Third Haven Records and *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXXVII, 317).

Thomas, born October 4, 1741, married, 1771, Rachel Denny, and had, with eight other children, a daughter, Rebecca who married William Wrightson and had issue.

Mary, born January 13, 1743, married Thomas Norris of West River, Anne Arundel County.

Benjamin, born December 18, 1745.

Sarah, twin with Benjamin, married July 5, 1764, Thomas Cokayne.

James, born August 30, 1749.

Joseph, born December 15, 1750, died young.

Ann, born July 10, 1752, married, first, William Wilson, second, Samuel Register, and third, Howell Powell.

John Kemp III and his wife, Mary Wrightson, were the parents of:

John Kemp IV, always known as " Quaker John Kemp," born January 27, 1764, married October 29, 1790, died March 28, 1829. His wife, Sarah Paschall Troth was born February 13, 1768, died May 27, 1848. These are they spoken of in the first paragraph of this paper. It was she and her daughters who kept the inner light bright at Betty's Cove after it had been abandoned by all others.

Robert, married Sarah Powell and had ten children.

Eleanor, married William Wilson.

Joseph and Thomas, both died young.

John Kemp IV by his wife, Sarah, had these children:

John Kemp V, married (1) 1816, Maria Lambdin, (2) 1842, Susan Lambdin, sister of Maria.

KEMP

Robert Kemp married 1678 Elizabeth Webb
immigrant 1664 — d. 1711. dau. Edmund and Eliz. Webb
b. 1650 d. 1702

- John Kemp I
  b. 1681 d. 1751
  m. 1705 Mary Ball
  dau. Lieut. Thomas and Susannah Ball
  - John Kemp II m. 1734 Magdaline
    d. 1773 — dau. of John Stevens and Eliz. Alcock
    m. 2. Eliz. Johns Troth
    - Mary b. 1743
      m. Thos. Norris
      Mary b. 1735 dy.
      Sarah, twin b. 1745
      m. 1764 Thos. Cokayne
    - Ann b. 1752
      m. 1. Wm. Wilson
      2. Sam'l. Register
      3. Howell Powell
    - Benjamin, twin b. 1745
      Joseph b. 1750 dy.
      James b. 1749
      Elizabeth b. 1739
      m. 1757 John Dixon
    - Thomas b. 1741
      m. 1771 Rachel Denny
      - Rebecca m. Wm. Wrightson
        8 others
    - John Kemp III
      b. 1737 d. 1790
      m. 1763 Mary Wrightson
      dau. Francis and Elinor W.
      - John Kemp IV m. 1790 Sarah Paschall Troth
        b. 1764 — b. 1768 d. 1848
        d. 1829
        - John Kemp V m. 1816 Maria Lambdin
          m. 1842 Susan Lambdin
          sister of Maria
        - Dr. Samuel Troth Kemp
          m. 1. Susannah Yarnall
          2. Eliz. Hardcastle
          Nov. 12, 1827
        - Henry
          Joseph
          Thomas m. Eliz. Wilson
          Robert m. Caroline Thomas
          Sarah Paschall m. John Bartlett
        - Phoebe
          Eleanor
          Mary
      - Robert m. Sarah Powell
        10 children
      - Joseph dy.
        Thomas dy.
      - Eleanor m. Wm. Wilson
  - James m. 1749 Elizabeth Harwood
    dau. Peter Harwood, Jr.
    widow Williams
    - James
      m. Mary Ball
    - Samuel
      Robert
    - Elizabeth
    - Sarah
      m. Benj. Cooper
    - Susannah m. Francis Neal
      Lydia
      m. Sam'l. Ball
  - Thomas
    Benjamin
    Joseph
  - Elizabeth
    m. Jas. Ball
    Rachel
  - Susannah
    m. 1. John Steward
    2. Peter Harwood
- Edmund
- William
  m. 1717 Martha Eubank
  - Elizabeth
    Rachel
    Martha
    Jane
    Constant
  - William
    m. ——
    - Quinton m. Lovry Charles
- Elizabeth
  m. Geo. Collison
- Jane
  m. 1. Robert Clothier
  2. 1702 Thomas Eubank
  - Rachel
    Sarah

Dr. Samuel Troth married (1) 1819, Susannah Yarnall, (2) Nov. 12, 1827, Elizabeth Hardcastle, and had issue by both marriages.

Thomas, married, 1832, Elizabeth Wilson.

Robert, married Caroline Thomas. (See *S. A. R. Magazine*, April, 1933, p. 347.)

Sarah Paschall, born March 3, 1806, married, 1831, John Bartlett.

Phoebe, Eleanor, Mary, Henry and Joseph.

The names of most of the families into which the Kemps married are among the oldest Quaker families of the State. Charts of some further descents have been transcribed by the author from his collection and copies of these have been deposited for those who are interested in examining them with the Maryland Historical Society. The Kemp family is large in Maryland and its representatives have taken high places in the affairs of the State, politically, socially, and financially.

Webb

The earliest Talbot patent for Edmund Webb, immigrant of about 1654, is "Webley," 400 acres in Talbot, December 12, 1672. Then on March 3, 1668/9, he acquired by deed from John Cock, 200 acres on the south side of the Sassafras River, "None soe good fin land" (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, XXV, 258 ff). Before coming to Talbot, Edmund Webb had been in Calvert and in Anne Arundel, and had also taken up some land in Dorchester. (*Archives*, XLI, 295.) His will, 1685, however, is a Talbot document. (Baldwin, *Calendar*, I, 166.) By it he devises to his daughter, Elizabeth Ceamp, fifty acres called "Bowlton." So came to the Kemps, "Boulton," long their home place with its long lane. From "Boulton" John Kemp IV and his family saw the British ascend the Bay in 1814. The spy glass used on the occasion was kept in a special niche built in the old home to receive it, but when the British sacked the place on their return, the glass had been removed to safe quarters and so is still in the possession of the Kemps. "Boulton" has passed from the Kemps in recent years, but ultimately it may pass into the sands of the Bay through the constant encroachment of the relentless tides.

In addition to Elizabeth, Edmund and Elizabeth Webb left other children, two sons, Edmund and William, and a daughter, Mary. This William Webb had, with a son William, a daughter Sarah.

Stevens

William Stevens, the immigrant, settled first at Patuxent in 1650 or 1651, in the Quaker settlement of Calvert County where his first land grant was near the mouth of the Patuxent River. (Land Office, Liber ABH, f. 141, and *Maryland Historical Magazine*, IX, p. 45.) Later he removed to Dorchester where he was appointed a Justice of the Peace. (Liber AM, Proceedings of the Council.) Again as William Stevens of Great Choptank, he was paid by order of the Council £0 24 03 " for his charge in the Indian war." The early records are replete with references to him. One relates to the establishment of the Town of Oxford. There is a Deed of Gift from William Stevens to the Lord Proprietary conveying thirty acres " for the settling and the building of the towne in Tread-Aven Creeke in Great Choptank."

William Stevens married Magdaline Gary (though some authority calls her Magdaline Hodges), eldest daughter of Stephen Gary. William Stevens died December 23, 1687, and his will was probated November 11th of that year. He and his wife are buried on land long held by subsequent members of the family, but now transferred to the family of Huffington. The children were:

John Stevens married Dorothy Preston, daughter of Richard Preston, " The Great Quaker." The relationship of John and William Stevens, questioned by some, is embraced in the registry of their cattle marks (*Archives*, X, 370), May 23, 1654. John Stevens' will was probated November 7, 1692. Baldwin, *Calendar*, II, 70.)

William removed to Talbot, married (1) 1670, Mary, the daughter of Dr. Peter and Judith Sharp, and (2) Sarah ————. (Liber JJ Provincial Court, f. 51 and *Maryland Historical Magazine* X, 284.) He also, in the days of his father, was a justice of the peace for Dorchester. (*Archives*, XVII, 380.) This fact has rendered difficult the separation of the records of the two. His will dated

STEVENS


William Stevens married Magdaline Gary
immigrant 1650
Patuxent 1651
d. 1687 in Dorchester
dau. of Stephen Gary,
d. 1686
John m. Dorothy Preston
dau. of Richard Preston
William m. 1670 (1) Mary
d. 1701
J.P. for
Talbot
dau. Dr. Peter and
Judith Sharp
m. (2) Sarah
d. 1719
Magdaline
John
William
Magdaline m. (1) Jas. Edmondson
(2) Dr. Jacob L. Loockerman
Grace m. James Woolford
John m. 1709 Elizabeth Alcock
d. 1742
b. 1687, dau. Thos.
and Hannah Alcock.
m. (2) Eliz. Johns Troth
Magdaline m. 1734 John Kemp II
d. 1773
Samuel
John
Samuel
b. 1778 in Talbot
Gov. of Md.
William
m. Elizabeth
Mary
Sarah m. Webb
Magdaline Maude

October 10, 1700, was probated April 17, 1701. (Will Book II, f. 97.) To his sons jointly he left all his lands at the Port of Williamstadt with the provision that if they die without issue the lands were to pass to the three daughters. To his widow, Sarah, he left interest in his son's Samuel's lands as also life interest in " Fowling Creek," to which he refers as bought from Thomas Taylor, and devised to his son, John. The widow, Sarah, died in 1719. The children were:

John Stevens, married first Elizabeth Alcock, daughter of Thomas and Hannah Alcock, May 6, 1704 (or 1709), second, Elizabeth Johns Troth, a widow. He received by his father's will " Dawson's Fortune," " Buckroe," and a part of " Catling's Plaine," which is near Oxford. He died about 1742.

William received the remainder of " Catling's Plaine," married Elizabeth ————. He died before 1719.

Samuel received " Compton " and " Edmondson's Lower Cove." From him is descended Governor Samuel Stevens, born July 13, 1778.

Mary, Sarah and Magdaline Maud.

The widow, Sarah, survived until 1719. In her will (Baldwin, *Calendar*, IV, 215) she mentions her daughters, Magdaline Maud and Sarah Webb, her son John, Elizabeth, widow of William Stevens, her granddaughter Sarah Webb, and her grandson Thomas Stevens.

John Stevens and his wife, Elizabeth, were the parents of several children including Magdaline Stevens, who married, 1734, John Kemp II.

BOOK REVIEWS

Archives of Maryland: LX—Proceedings of the County Court of Charles County, 1666-1674 (Court Series 9). J. Hall Pleasants, Editor; Louis Dow Scisco, Associate Editor. Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1943. li, 635 pp.

With the publication of the Charles County Court proceedings for the period 1666-1674 the Maryland Historical Society has but one more volume remaining to be published in order to provide a complete picture of local justice in tidewater Maryland in the third quarter of the seventeenth century. The remaining volume will be the Somerset County proceedings, which have been published in part for the period 1665-1668 (*Md. Arch.*, LIV). This program has been part of a larger plan, now successfully accomplished—the presentation of a cross-section of the legal procedure of Maryland for that period, including all the higher courts—the Provincial and Chancery Courts, and the Upper House of the General Assembly sitting as a Court of Appeals—together with all proceedings of inferior courts for the corresponding period which are still extant. It is hoped that for the following generation at the turn of the century a similar cross-section of the colony's jurisprudence will soon be available. We now have in print the proceedings of the Court of Appeals beginning at 1695, for which we are indebted to the late Judge Carroll T. Bond, whose passing all students of American legal history lament. The Hall of Records Commission proposes to publish the proceedings of Prince George's County Court, and it is to be hoped that in the not too distant future the Provincial Court proceedings for the corresponding years will also be available in the *Archives*.

The court proceedings of Charles County for the period under review differ considerably in character from the preceding eight-year period previously published in volume LIII of the *Archives*. The record is less detailed, extremely sparse on the criminal side, and lacking the spicy, informal summary of testimony which the earlier clerks had taken pains to enter on the record. In this period there were frequent changes of clerkships. Some had only recently arrived in the province, and the majority were not very efficient. As a result, these proceedings do not appear to constitute a full record. For example, while births, marriages, and deaths were recorded, only sixty births, seven marriages, and sixteen deaths were listed for the nine-year period under examination. This is obviously

an incomplete record for a county with an average population of 1800 persons. While a good part of the criminal proceedings appear to have been left out, many routine entries were made. It is likely that the Somerset proceedings for the same period will be fuller and more illuminating, as well down to the end of the seventeenth century the Princess Anne records contain a great deal of material of an evidential nature.

An impressive part of the proceedings of this county court was taken up with real estate transactions. The clerks recorded a great proportion of all the deeds and other land records in the county in this period. A survey of them reveals that fee simple estates were almost invariably preferred to entails at that time. Reservation was made, of course, for the payment of rents and services to the "chief Lord of the Signory," perhaps more frequently referred to as the "Lord Proprietor."

The bulk of cases which came up in the court in this period were civil suits. The editors estimate that over ninety per cent. of these were for debt on a bill obligatory—the predecessor of the modern promissory note. However, in computing this figure the editors apparently classified suits in trespass on the case in the nature of assumpsit in the same category as actions of debt, whereas in law they were entirely different and distinct actions, the former seeking damages rather than restitution of property. In fact, the action of tresspass on the case is not listed in the index, nor is assumpsit, although both actions were not infrequently brought. A careful legal analysis of this litigation, which the editors were not able to provide, would reveal a great deal of informality in procedure before the court, a characteristic of the day and age in the American colonies. Thus, one action of debt is combined with an action for damages for trespass for the forceful taking away of chattels (pp. 189, 190).

Many of the cases arising in this court are of contemporary significance to us today. In the southern colonies the regulation of the price of liquor and other tavern charges may be said to have been the most consistent example of price regulation undertaken by the county or sessions courts right through the Revolutionary period. The Maryland legislature in 1671 admitted that as a result of the absence of price legislation innkeepers had exacted most "unconscionably." Hence, rates for brandy, rum, wines, strong beer, and ale were set as well as "dyett" and lodging (*Md. Arch.*, II, 295). Under this act John Allen was presented by the grand jury in 1675, but, as the charges could not be substantiated, "the presentment was dasht" (p. 519).

Labor relations occupied a good deal of the court's attention. At the March, 1673, court it was ordered that henceforth no person should be permitted to act as attorney for any servant, but such as the court should appoint (p. 496). Apparently attorneys for servants had been too aggressive in the past in bringing actions against masters, to the latters' "greate charge and dammage." As the personnel of the court was made up of exclusively of masters, the servants could scarcely be accused of getting a "break" by this ruling, which appears to be without parallel in the colonies. These records attest that the life of the bound servant in the tobacco

colonies was no bed of roses. Three inquests over the bodies of dead servants were held by the coroner in one year alone. The master's right of discipline over his servant was upheld. In one case where a maid-servant had been put in irons by her mistress, tied to her bedpost, and beaten until "there was a puddle of blood in the room and great wounds in her back," the jury freed the servant, apparently on the legal technicality that, where she had been whipped for running away, the time she was absent would not be added to her original term. If she had been whipped for other offenses, the runaway time might be added (pp. 234-235). Incidentally, under the statute quite consistently enforced during this period, the penalty for running away was ten days of extra service for each day's unlawful absence. The master's property interest in his servant was upheld by the court. He could assign his servant to another in exchange for other property—and some planters appear to have been dealers in servants (pp. 147, 169) and, under the act of 1671, he could and did prosecute anyone who harbored or entertained his servant or enticed him to leave his service. Pirating of workers is a practice not confined to war plants of the present day!

Despite the more formal character of these records as compared with the earlier years, there is a wealth of material of equal interest to the social and the legal historian. These proceedings have been edited in accord with the high standards which mark the entire court series, and are prefaced with a provocative historical introduction.

RICHARD B. MORRIS

The College of the City of New York

Racing in America, 1665-1865. By JOHN HERVEY. New York: The Jockey Club, 1944. Privately printed. Two volumes.

The Jockey Club is greatly to be congratulated on its publication of this much needed work on the history of racing in America and the breeding of the American thoroughbred horse. The two large and beautifully printed volumes that make up this book are very fully illustrated with portraits of the men who, from the earliest Colonial days, imported, bred and raced horses in this country. There are also many pictures of their manor houses and of their most famous horses which are the ancestors of the American thoroughbred of today. Though this monumental work must obviously have required years of patient research, it is written in the most readable and entertaining style and should be of great value and interest to all breeders of thoroughbred horses and lovers of racing. The book, which takes in the years 1665-1865, completes the history of American racing which the Jockey Club had previously published in a volume by W. S. Vosburg covering the years 1865-1922.

The book is divided into different periods such as the "Early and Later Colonial Periods," "Through the Revolution," "The Early Nineteenth Century" and "Through the Civil War." In each of these periods horses

and racing in the Northern and Southern States are treated separately. Valuable information is given in an Appendix to each volume which contains lists of imported stallions and mares, tabulated pedigrees, leading American sires and winners of principal Jockey Club purses.

Few among the large crowds which flock to our modern race tracks have stopped to consider what the beginning of racing in America must have been like or what veritable pioneer work had to be done by the sportsmen of those early days. Many of the English settlers, especially in Virginia, had brought horses and the love of racing from the Old World, but the land had not as yet been cleared of its primeval forest and dense undergrowth and it was almost impossible to find a spot in which to lay out a course in any way resembling the ones we have today. Not only was labour scarce, so that it would have been difficult to clear enough land for a race course, but it would have been very dangerous to assemble a large gathering of settlers in an undefended open space which would have invited attack from the Indians. Any racing that was done had to take place on the main highways or even through the streets of towns. In Philadelphia Sassafras Street was a favourite stretch for many an early race and it came to be popularly known as Race Street, a name that was at last formally adopted by the city fathers and remains to this day. The practise of racing along streets and highways necessarily caused many accidents and soon had to be forbidden by law. Plymouth Colony, for instance, in 1674 decreed that "whatever person shall run a race with a horse kind in any street or common road shall forfeit five shillings in money forthwith to be levied by the Constable or sit in the stockes one hour if it be not paid."

Before the circular race course came into general use its forerunner was the race path, generally a narrow strip of ground, about fifteen to twenty feet wide, and from a quarter of a mile to 500 yards long. At the starting end of the path booths were set up in which food and drink were sold; peddlers hawked their wares and fortune tellers plied their trade. The motley crowd of spectators included such varied and picturesque characters as cavaliers and their richly dressed wives, mounted on well groomed horses and attended by negro slaves; a sporting parson rubbed shoulders with trappers in their deerskin clothing and beaver hats, while a note of romance and danger was added by a group of Indian braves, their savage, bronzed features topped by towering feathered headdresses. Some of the racing was for money and, at a later date, for silver cups, but many races were run for tobacco and in 1786 one of the stakes is known to have been for as much as 100,000 pounds of tobacco.

The first organized racing in America was started by Governor Nicholls of New York in 1665. A great lover of horses, Governor Nicholls had a course laid out on Hempstead Plains in Nassau County, Long Island and, in announcing that he would present a silver cup to be run for each spring and fall, he stated that he was offering his cups "not so much for the divertisement of youth as for encouraging the bettering of the breed of horses, which through great neglect has been impaired." The course was named Newmarket, in honour of the King's favourite course and it was

not too far from New York to draw big crowds from that city although it meant taking the ferry and then riding or driving a distance of some twenty miles. It is interesting to note that the approximate site chosen by Governor Nicholls still continues to be the chief center of racing in this country.

Many amusing incidents enliven the book. We learn, for instance, that in Maryland there was such a strong liaison between the church and the turf that one of the first, if not the first known mention of racing in that colony subsequent to the year 1700 records the resolution of a vestry in 1727 "to meet on Thursday at the race-ground near the Bensons." We are also told of the rivalry which existed between horse owners in Maryland and Virginia and that the Virginians, having been beaten in numerous races by their next door neighbors, resorted to the unsportsmanlike length of barring Maryland-bred horses from their meetings. The Marylanders, however, retaliated by sending their best stallions and mares across the river so that their foals would be Virginia bred. It will come as a surprise to most of us to read of the only known instance in which two Presidents of the United States opposed each other on the race course—when George Washington's stallion, Magnolio, was beaten by a roan colt belonging to Thomas Jefferson. Though only 800 copies of *Racing in America* have been printed, no sporting library will ever be really complete without it.

HARVEY S. LADEW

Four Late Eighteenth Century Anglo-American Landscape Painters. By J. HALL PLEASANTS. (Reprinted from the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society, October 1942). Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1943. 146 pp., plates.

Students of early American painting have long owed a debt of gratitude to Dr. J. Hall Pleasants. All who have worked at the Frick Art Reference Library in this field have come to appreciate the thoroughness of his historical investigations and the soundness of his critical judgments. The great corpus of photographs and biographical material which he has assembled in Baltimore relating to the painters who worked in Maryland, from the very earliest times, is a model of regional scholarship. Here are recorded the efforts of those forgotten local limners, thoroughly documented and expertly catalogued, as well as the works of those once famous artists who passed through the state. It is from the results of such labours, when completed for other cultural centers of our country, that the history of American painting will some day be written.

Two studies have appeared as the result of Dr. Pleasants' investigations. (No mention is here made of his monumental book on Maryland Silver or of the numerous volumes of the Maryland Archives which have appeared under his editorship.) The first was *Justus Engelhardt Kühn*, one of our earliest portrait painters; the second was *Joshua Johnston, The First*

American Negro Portrait Painter. Dr. Pleasants' latest publication, *Four Late Eighteenth Century Anglo-American Landscape Painters,* Worcester, Massachusetts, 1943, is much broader in scope than the other studies and should be of great interest to all who would understand the difficulties of these struggling artists who endeavored to earn a living by the practise of "landskip" painting in the days of our early republic.

The four painters whose lives are so completely recorded and whose works are criticized and catalogued, are George Beck, William Groombridge, Francis Guy and William Winstanley. To many students and to most general readers, these four names must be almost unknown, or at least remembered only from a passing reference in Dunlap.

The careful research which Dr. Pleasants has done so well is an original contribution, necessary for a better understanding of landscape painting in America before the rise of the Hudson River School. Not only has he examined, listed and described all of the known paintings by his artists, but he has also enumerated all of their pictures of which any exhibition record, in this country or in England, exists. But he has done far more than compile a catalogue raissonné. From the files of old and obscure newspapers, memoirs, diaries and letters, he has with deftness and skill brought these long dead painters back to life. It is doubtful whether many additional facts telling of their struggles, failures and minor triumphs will ever be recovered, so thoroughly has he performed his task. And triumphs some of them did have, for one found a patron in our first great collector, Robert Gilmor, and two had the distinction of selling their landscapes to President Washington.

It is the bombastic Guy who most appeals to this reader and one feels that he is also Dr. Pleasants' favorite. The checkered career of this "painter, dyer, minister and religious controversialist, versifyer, dentist, oil cloth and patent paper-carpet manufacturer" is excellently portrayed. How modern seem his controversies with his fellow painter, Groombridge, and that unnecessarily caustic lady critic, "Beatrice Ironsides." This vituperative newspaper war which Dr. Pleasants has discovered and retold, casts a vivid light on the art racket of early Baltimore.

Guy's paintings of city views and gentlemen's seats have a greater appeal than the works of Beck, Groombridge or Winstanley, and they seem more American in flavour. The soft foliage of the trees, the little figures strolling in pairs across the foreground, and the subdued atmospheric effects, give his pictures a quaint distinction. He also shows considerable variety both in treatment and in subject. Perhaps his most successful picture is the *Winter Scene in Brooklyn*, but we should not neglect his two views of the *Pennington Mills* or the large *Baltimore from Chapel Hill.* This last canvas, long attributed to Charles Willson Peale, is a most important iconographic record of our city as it appeared in 1803. Unfortunately the picture is no longer in the city it so well portrays.

Dr. Pleasants attributes nineteen paintings to Guy. All of these he has examined and dated, and he has given their ownership and provenance. There is also a long list of pictures, many of them most interesting, judging

from their titles, which are no longer to be found. Let us hope some of them at least may be recovered and that Dr. Pleasants will publish another book, fully illustrated, devoted entirely to Guy. His landscapes deserve a far wider recognition and his varied life and eccentric personality warrant a fuller treatment. We should all be most grateful to Dr. Pleasants for making it possible for us to understand this man and his three contemporaries, and to appreciate their work.

MACGILL JAMES

National Gallery of Art

Rivers of the Eastern Shore: Seventeen Maryland Rivers. By HULBERT FOOTNER. Illustrated by Aaron Sopher. [Rivers of America Series.] New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944. 375 pp. $2.50.

Mr. Footner, whose book *Maryland Main and the Eastern Shore* delighted so many Marylanders, has again done the people of his adopted State a good service.

Mr. Footner's latest book, *Rivers of the Eastern Shore*, tells the story of 17 rivers which traverse that garden spot of Maryland. He has unearthed many things which will surprise Marylanders. And some things, I believe, which will surprise our best historians.

For instance, he contends that the last blood of the Revolutionary War was shed in the Battle of Kedge's Straits, two weeks after the fight at James Island, S. C., on November 14, 1782, which heretofore has been called the last fight of the war. And the Battle of Kedge's Straits was an American defeat.

The battle was between five American barges under Commodore Walley and six "British" barges of Joseph Whaland, the Tory leader. Whaland and his Tories ravaged the lower Eastern Shore almost unmolested, and the patriots of Somerset and Worcester counties made many appeals to Annapolis for help.

The Commodore's barge was boarded by the enemy, and Walley was killed fighting on the deck of his ship. The other American barges beat a retreat, pursued by the enemy. As the result of an investigation, one of the American captains was dismissed from the service.

These Eastern Shore Tories were called Picaroons by the patriots and they were a hard lot—according to the patriots. They plundered and burned the homes of loyal Americans and became so bold that at one time they had both the Wicomico and Nanticoke rivers blockaded.

Mr. Footner makes other statements which are apt to shock some of the natives. In the Courthouse at Princess Anne, one of the loveliest towns on the Shore, hangs a fine, contemporary portrait of Good Queen Anne, by Sir Godfrey Kneller. And Queen Anne is pointed out as the patron saint of the town.

But Mr. Footner says that Princess Anne was not named for Queen Anne, who was so generous with Communion plate for the Maryland churches,

but for another and less distinguished Princess Anne, the daughter of George II.

Mr. Footner divides the people of the Shore into two distinct groups, separated by the Choptank river. He holds that the difference between those who dwell north of the dividing line and those who live in what Mencken dubbed Transchoptankia is largely spiritual. And he follows this with the unique theory that the lower Shore was settled early by Quakers from Virginia, who were non-conformists and independent folk, and, as a result, the residents of this section are more inclined to lawlessness than are their brethren north of the Choptank.

Rivers of the Eastern Shore is written in Mr. Footner's most engaging style, and makes excellent reading for those who do not take history too seriously.

RICHARD D. STEUART

George Henry Calvert, American Literary Pioneer. By IDA GERTRUDE EVERSON. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944. 330 pp. $3.75.

A biography, when done with care and judgment, is always a useful book, even though its subject may not have been a major figure; and it is fortunate when the toil of preparing a Ph. D. dissertation can be directed to such a task. Dr. Everson has studied George Henry Calvert with great thoroughness and has presented the results in a readable book.

It is quite true, as she remarks, that Calvert "has been all but forgotten." His name has disappeared from the biographical dictionaries and literary manuals and his books are out of print and out of mind. His fine bust done in marble by Hiram Powers stands unnoted in the Johns Hopkins University Library and the shelf of his numerous works, presented years ago by his widow, is rarely disturbed. Yet the story of his life has many sources of interest. There is his mysterious kinship with the family of the Maryland proprietaries and his maternal ancestry reaching back to Peter Paul Rubens, whose life he wrote; his boyhood on a Maryland plantation; his study at Harvard and his share there in "the great rebellion"; and his study and travel abroad. Interesting also are his literary friendships. In 1835 he called on Goethe, then seventy-five, as a few years later he sought out Wordsworth at Rydal Mount; and both visits bore fruit, for Calvert was the first American to write a biography of Goethe and the first to devote a volume to the life and work of Wordsworth.

Having a small competence inherited through his mother, he made bold to ignore his father's advice to choose a rich wife or a lucrative profession, married Elizabeth Steuart in 1829, and set up a home on Pleasant Street, Baltimore, in which to make literature his career. After varied experiences as critic, editor, and professor of philosophy, he decided to try the more congenial intellectual atmosphere of New England. In September 1844 he bought a home in Newport, Rhode Island, and lived there for more than forty years, writing, lecturing, and dipping into local politics, meanwhile

enjoying the friendship of the Boston literary coterie and particularly of Emerson and Margaret Fuller.

Whether this career justifies Dr. Everson's subtitle, "American literary pioneer," is open to question. Calvert was indeed one of our early interpreters of European culture; but he did not blaze trails which a later generation was to tread. He was, to use his own word, susceptive of new ideas—phrenology, Fourierism, spiritualism, hydropathy, vegetarianism—but in his perception of literary trends and his judgment of contemporary taste he lagged behind rather than led his age.

Poe's description of George Calvert's poetry as "feeble and commonplace" was perhaps needlessly harsh; but dull the verses certainly are, and the prose, except for some special interest, is no longer to be recommended for reading. The man's biography is another matter and, especially in the part of it that concerns his residence in Maryland, it will reward examination.

JOHN C. FRENCH

Some Addresses—The By-Product of a Federal Judge. By W. CALVIN CHESNUT. [Baltimore: Privately printed, 1944.] 288 pp.

Judge Chesnut in his foreword modestly cautions the reader that the addresses are "for reference rather than for steady reading." But "steady reading" is what laymen, no less than lawyers, should give to this collection covering a range of useful information. It is not possible, in a short review, to even approach the contents of the addresses. One may only state the subjects, with a few comments, leaving to interested persons further consideration.

The first address—"History of the Federal Courts in Maryland"—will hold the reader because of local history. From the first session of the Federal Court held 1790 in Baltimore Town to the present, one learns of early judges, court officers, places of holding court and some famous cases. There pass in review names of men who made Maryland famous. We are told that Judge William Paca, the first District Judge, was always punctual in attendance, and his example has certainly been followed by those of his successors who are remembered by lawyers now practicing. Lost to history is the location before 1822 of the Baltimore Federal Court House, though the Court records show a session of the Court at "Evans Inn"—(also lost to memory)—thereby holding equal honor with the Supreme Court which once held its session at a tavern. But an early American inn perhaps had the flavor of an English one, to which Dr. Johnson was wont to pay such high tribute.

There follows a series of addresses on various subjects delivered to particular groups and an interesting article originally appearing in the Pennsylvania Law Review on the history of the ground rent system in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

The addresses on "Improvements in Judicial Procedure," "English Courts" and "Probation in Criminal Procedure" will attract the lawyer,

but laymen observing court procedure will profit by reading them. That is particularly so of the "English Courts," for one can learn much about the administration of law from English judges and lawyers, who are such masters of their craft. The address on the probation system considers the age-old question "does punishment deter?"

"The Courts and the Press" is a valuable paper. We are largely indebted to Mr. Jefferson for the constitutional guarantee of a free press, meaning a press free from government license or censorship. Regarding it he once wrote "Nature has given to man no other means of sifting out the truth, either in religion, laws or politics." But the privilege has its limitations. It does not mean privilege to libel or "trial by newspapers." It is with relation to the last that Judge Chesnut makes a "warrant of resurvey of the dividing line between 'freedom of the press' and contempt of court," and the resurvey is certainly well done.

There is an address on the late Judge John C. Rose, sometime District and Circuit Judge, a gentleman of outstanding personality and learning. Another is to naturalized citizens outlining their obligations to their new country. Still another is that welcoming Dr. Bowman to the Johns Hopkins University, with the short address presenting to the University the portrait of Hon. Newton D. Baker, of the Class of 1892, distinguished lawyer and Secretary of War under Mr. Wilson. Other addresses are to the Alumni of the law school where affectionate tribute was paid to Judge Henry David Harlan, an able jurist and one of Maryland's finest citizens; to the St. George's Society in Baltimore, now existing for nearly eighty years; the Civic League of Roland Park; the Society of the Sons of Rvolution and at Bel Air on "I am an American Day."

As is to be expected from one, who while at the bar was a finished lawyer and now distinguished judge, the addresses are thoroughly prepared. Published by Judge Chesnut for private circulation, he has thoughtfully placed the volume on the shelves of the libraries where it may be obtained by interested readers.

CHARLES C. WALLACE

National Academy of Design Exhibition Record, 1826-1860. New York: New-York Historical Society, 1943. 2 vols.

"The National Academy of Design Exhibition Record 1826-1860" compiled by Bartlett Cowdry and published by the New York Historical Society places in the hands of scholars in the field of American history and the history of American art a work as useful as the late Algernon Graves' *The Royal Academy of Arts . . .*, with the valuable additional help of a most complete index which includes artist, subject and owner. These two volumes contain a mine of first hand information and give immediately material which heretofore could not have been obtained without months of searching. For those whose interests make this type of reading a favorite form of literature it provides many hours of pleasurable study.

Miss Cowdrey's concise and thorough Introduction gives a brief sketch of the National Academy, cites her sources and clearly defines the scope and purpose of the volumes; it is unnecessary to paraphrase it here but one may acknowledge the fact that libraries, museums, historical societies and many individuals in varied fields are indebted to her for filling a long felt need, and to the New York Historical Society for making the work available to the public. It remains but to urge other old institutions to republish their catalogues and pamphlets in as fine a manner.

In the field of *Marylandia* the volumes give such facts as: At the first exhibition, in 1826, one E. W. Bridges exhibited a View of the Exchange at Baltimore; that Robert Cary Long exhibited architectural designs in 1827 and 1828 and at the time of his death was an Honorary Member, Professional; that Robert Gilmor was elected an Honorary Member, Amateur, in 1833; that in 1835 William James Bennett exhibited a View of Etna Mills, Jones Falls; that Maximilian Godefroy exhibited his Battle of Pultowa in 1842; in 1843 a portrait of Miss Josephine Clifton was exhibited by John Beale Bordley; that Alfred J. Miller exhibited in 1844 and 1845; in 1858 Thomas W. Wood exhibited "The Baltimore News Vendor" (owned by John C. Brune); that the miniature of Mrs. William Greenway by George Freeman, now owned by the Maryland Historical Society, was exhibited in 1844. Another item from the Society's collection, "The Jester," a drawing by Frank B. Mayer, was exhibited in 1860. Originally owned by S. H. Wyman, it was given to the Society by the late Mrs. H. Irvine Keyser in 1925 and is a portrait of "Crazy Jakes," a Negro character of Baltimore, the brother of Frederick and Henry Jakes, the well known caterers from c. 1840 to c. 1870.

ANNA WELLS RUTLEDGE

Quebec to Carolina in 1785-1786. Being the Travel Diary and Observations of Robert Hunter, Jr., a Young Merchant of London. Edited by LOUIS B. WRIGHT and MARION TINLING. San Marino, Cal.: Huntington Library, 1943. 393 pp.

Marylanders will be interested in what young Robert Hunter, Jr. thought of Baltimore when he visited there just after the Revolution. The twenty-year-old English merchant appears to have been introduced to the most prominent people in the town. He dined with Colonel Samuel Smith and Colonel John Eager Howard and called on Robert Gilmor. At Colonel Smith's he enjoyed a minuet. "The ladies," wrote Hunter, "are perfectly free and easy in their manners, dress remarkably well, and dance still better. They are much gayer here than in Philadelphia."

The young merchant thought "Belvidera," the home of John Eager Howard, "a most beautiful spot." Coming home from a dance given there by Colonel Howard, Hunter related how "every jolt of the wagon gave me a *genteel* opportunity of either grasping a charming waist or taking hold of a delightful hand. It's something uncommon to Europeans to return from an assembly with ladies in a wagon. . . ."

The youth was astonished by all the commercial activity he saw in Baltimore, by the market place, the number of shops, and ships in the harbor. From Baltimore he went to Mount Vernon where he had the honor of being "lighted up" to his bedroom by General Washington himself. Hunter was impressed by Washington's "noble and venerable appearance."

Baltimore was one of the few places in America which the young Englishman really liked. He was disappointed with Richmond where, according to the diarist, "the streets are up to your knees in mud almost every step you take in a bad day, and in the summertime you are blinded with dust. The houses are almost all built of wood and painted different colors. . . . The governor's house is a very poor one and the courthouse the shabbiest I ever saw. . . ." In view of the fact that Richmond had been founded about fifty years before this and had been the capital of Virginia only since 1779, this criticism was hardly fair.

Places south of Richmond did not make a better impression on Hunter. He complained of the cost of travelling in America when it then amounted to about a guinea a day. Bugs and mosquitoes plagued him on his travels; his body became swollen from their bites. He describes Wilmington as "the most disagreeable, sandy, barren town I have visited on the continent—consisting of a few scattered wood and brick houses. . . ." Although Hunter also visited Boston, Philadelphia and New York, he thought there was little variety in the American scene. In one entry in his diary he wrote that he was sick of "this cursed country and every day grow more and more averse to it. It's impossible for a man here to have any pleasure or satisfaction in his life. . . ."

As a diarist young Hunter shows no literary ability or style and too often his comments display the smugness characteristic of a privileged English youth. At the same time it should be remembered that he travelled through Canada and America at an extremely interesting period in their history. For this reason, and also due to the fact that Hunter often gives us many details about travelling, taverns and local customs, his diary is an important and at times vivid description of American life in the late eighteenth century.

RAPHAEL SEMMES

Early Catonsville and the Caton Family. By GEORGE C. KEIDEL. Reprinted from the *Catonsville Argus,* 1912-1913. [Privately printed], Baltimore, 1944.

Dr. Keidel's little book rambles up and down and around in Baltimore County and never gets very far from Catonsville. It is not a detailed history, and perhaps it never would have been had the author lived to complete it. That it was a labor of love, and that the laborer knew every inch of his territory shows on every page. The chapters were published in the Catonsville paper thirty years ago and now are brought into a book, with the assistance of William B. Marye and, one suspects, of the editor of this *Magazine.* It is not possible to quote much of the contents, but a reading

of the chapter heads gives an idea of the whole: Geological History; Indian History; Hunters and Trappers; Patapsco a Thoroughfare; Early Hunting Ridge Grants; Mrs. Richard Caton. The illustrations add to the attractiveness of the book: an index of proper names would have added still more.

ELIZABETH MERRITT

Historical Societies in the United States and Canada: A Handbook. Compiled and edited by CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN, Editor, and DORIS GODARD, Editorial Associate. Washington, D. C.: American Association for State and Local History, 1944. 261 pp. $2.50.

This book expands and brings up to date the preceding Handbook (1936) and is number 4 in the series which began in 1908. It lists no less than 904 active historical societies and 564 others of which there is record but which failed to send information regarding themselves; no doubt many of these last are moribund. This showing compares with 583 active and 15 non-reporting societies shown in the 1936 handbook—sufficient evidence of the growing interest in local history, which in Maryland as elsewhere has been marked during the last decade. Besides the obvious data on the individual institutions the Handbook furnishes the financial status and annual dues, size of library and special collections, character of museum holdings, publications, lectures and other activities. Maryland is represented by 12 active (in which the Hall of Records is included) and 3 inactive societies.

J. W. F.

Local History: How to Gather It, Write It, and Publish It. By DONALD DEAN PARKER. Revised and edited by Bertha E. Josephson for the Committee on Guide for Study of Local History of the Social Science Research Council. [1944] 186 pp. $1.00.

This is a guide to the preparation of articles and books on all phases of local history. Seemingly nothing is overlooked, from sources of information to details of composition, indexing and modes of publication or reproduction. If some of the text seems trite, we may remember that the book is intended for the guidance of beginners. On the other hand, its summary of technical processes will be useful to all.

J. W. F.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Julian P. Boyd, Librarian at Princeton University, who is engaged in preparing for publication a full edition of the letters and other papers of Thomas Jefferson, has asked that the *Magazine* give emphasis to this project, not only in the interest of obtaining the cooperation of members

of the Society and other readers in forwarding letters of the third President for inclusion, but also to inform owners of manuscript collections that letters written *to Jefferson by others* are sought. Such material will be of great assistance in editing letters Jefferson himself wrote. All who own letters from or to Jefferson are requested to send Dr. Boyd photostats of such letters, or the originals for copying. The latter will be returned as soon as possible to the sender. This great undertaking, sponsored by Princeton University and underwritten by the New York Times Company, is expected to result in a set of about 50 printed volumes.

One of the most interesting occasions in the recent history of the Society was the address of the late Dr. Charles McLean Andrews at the meeting of the Society on May 5, 1941, on the topic "On the Preservation of Historical Manuscripts." Admirers of Dr. Andrews and students of history will be glad to know that the revised text of this address is contained in the first issue of the Third Series of the *William and Mary Quarterly,* which has now been enlarged to encompass the entire field of early American history. The number is dated January, 1944, and contains also a sketch of Dr. Andrews and a bibliography of his writings.

Moreland—Who were the parents of Hanson Bradley Moreland, who married Sarah Adkins in Alexandria, Va., on September 7, 1809?

Mrs. William W. Lincoln,
212 Bartlett Ave., Luray, Va.

Contributors to this Number

Dr. Max P. Allen is a member of the history department of Indiana University and is assistant director of the Indiana War History Commission. ☆ Dr. William D. Hoyt, Jr. is a member of the Society's staff. ☆ Co-author with Mrs. Francis F. Beirne of the book, *The Hammond-Harwood House and Its Owners* (Annapolis, 1941) Edith Rossiter Bevan (Mrs. William F. Bevan) has long been a collector of bookplates and has generously contributed to the enrichment of the Society's collection. ☆ Capt. Charles B. Clark of the Marines is on active duty in the Pacific. He is a native of Ellicott City. ☆ Descended from several Maryland families, Emerson B. Roberts has by way of avocation made extensive studies among the early Quaker pedigrees of the State. He is a member of the staff of the Westinghouse Company, Pittsburgh.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIX

Names of authors and titles of contributed papers and original documents are entered in small capitals. Titles of books reviewed or cited are in italics.

Abercrombie, Miss., 294.
AN ACCOUNT OF THE JOHN BROWN RAID, by Rosalie (Gannt) Thurston, Mrs. Charles Buckner, 162-163
Adams, James Truslow, editor, *Album of American History: Colonial Period*, reviewed, 165-166
Adams, William, 66, 71
Addison, Rev. Walter Dulany, 245
William Meade, 245
Admiralty, Board of, U. S. N., 43-44
Agent and Receiver General (Maryland), 53, 54
Aikman, William, bookseller, 314
Alagon, Duke of, 130, 131
Albert, Augustus, 150
Albion, Robert G., 17
Album of American History: Colonial Period, edited by James Truslow Adams, *reviewed*, 165-166
Alcock, Hannah, Mrs. Thomas, 343, 344
Thomas, 343, 344
Alexander, Thomas Harwood, 245
Thomas S., 317
All Saints Parish, Frederick County, 59 *ff.*
Allen, John, 346
Max P., 358
MAX P., *William Pinkney's First Public Service*, 277-292
Bennet, 49-72, 106
Elizabeth, 51, 52, 56, 61 *ff.*
Allison, Rev. Patrick, 6
Maj. Richard T., 138, 139
Alricks, Hermanus, 203, 215, 221, 301
American and Commercial Daily Advertiser, 101
American Historical Societies, 1790-1860, by Leslie W. Dunlap, *reviewed*, 273
American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England, by Clarence Gohdes, 175
American party, (Know-nothing party), 25, 26, 28
"Amicable Society," 117
AMONG THE "MEETERS AT THE BAYSIDE," by Emerson B. Roberts, 335-344
Anderson, Maj. Archibald, 82
Ephraim F., 47
André, Maj. John, 273
Andrews, Charles McLean, 358
Matthew Page, 27, 170, 174
Matthew Page, *Social Planning by Frontier Thinkers*, 175
Angle, Paul M., 30
Anne, Queen, 351, 352
Annual Register, 70
Archer, Dr. John, 104, 126
Archives of Maryland, LIX, reviewed, 168-169
Archives of Maryland, LX, reviewed, 345-347
"Aristides" (pseud. for Alex. Contee Hanson), 281, 286
Armistead, Maj. George, 181, 190, 195, 196, 198, 204, 218, 223, 224, 295 *ff.*
Armstrong, James, 203, 208, 303
John, Sec'y of War, 182 *ff.*
Arnest, Caleb, 210, 216
Ascension Church, Westminster, 238, 242
Assembly Rooms, 7
Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, 117
Association of Freemen of Maryland, 277
Athenaeum, The, 2-3, 23
Auckerman, George, 210, 216, 218, 297
Audubon, J. J., 23
Austrian, Charles R., M. D., 165
"Avondale," Carroll County, 237

Babcock, Capt. Samuel, 214, 217, 218, 297, 300, 303
Badger, Miss., 243
Baker, Newton D., 354
Balch, Thomas, 82
Baldwin, Benjamin R., 285
Summerfield, 139
Ball, Elizabeth (Kemp), Mrs. James, 338, 340
James, 338, 340
Susannah, Mrs. Thomas, 337, 340
Lieut. Thomas, 337, 338, 340
Baltimore, Charles, 3rd Lord, 103
Frederick, 6th Lord, 53, 54, 56, 57
Baltimore American, 16, 150, 151, 153, *ff.*, 294, 296, 298, 316, 317, 326

Baltimore and Potomac Steam Packet Company, 124
Baltimore and Susquehanna Railroad, 125
Baltimore *Clipper*, 29, 31, 34, 45 *ff.*, 319
Baltimore Daily Gazette, 153, 319
Baltimore Daily Repository, 8
Baltimore Evening Post, 101
Baltimore Fire Insurance Company, 111
Baltimore Gazette, 101
Baltimore Patriot, 101
Baltimore Patriot and Evening Advertiser, 101
Baltimore Telegraph, 101
Baltimore Water Company, 97
Bancroft, George, 282, 284
Baringer, William, 27
Barker, Charles Albro, 169
Barnes, Samuel, 100
Barney, Commodore Joshua, 203
William B., 203
William Chase, 102, 103
Barr, John, innkeeper, 121
R. H., 124
Barringer, Mr., 131
Barry, Robert, 223, 300
Bartgis, Matthias & Son, Frederick, 107
Bartlett, John, 340, 341
Sarah Pascall (Kemp), Mrs. John, 341, 340
Bateman, Lord, 64
Bates, Edward, 27, 29
Bathurst, Lord, 65
Beale, Gen. Edward F., 261
Capt. George, 261
Lieut. Thomas, 83, 84
Beale, Truxton, 261
Beall, Lieut. Thomas, 83, 84
Beard, Charles A., 283, 284
Beatty, James, 215, 219, 296
Beck, George, 350
Becker, Ernest J., 174
Beckham, Mr., 163
Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy, by Charles W. Ramsdell, *reviewed*, 85
Beirne, Francis F., 90
Rosamond R., Mrs. Francis F., 92, 280, 358
Belfast, Frederick County, 96
Bell, Alexander Graham, 225
John (Tennessee), 28, 331
" Belvoir," Anne Arundel Co., 252
" Belvidera," 355
Bend, Rev. J. G. J., 6
BENNET ALLEN, FIGHTING PARSON, by Josephine Fisher, 49-72
Bennett, Ann Murray (Carmichael), Mrs. Richard, 274
William James, 355
Berry, Capt. 195
Benjamin, 202, 207, 211, 215, 217, 221, 299
Betty's Cove Meeting, 335
Bevan, Edith R., Mrs. William F., 94, 280, 358
BEVAN, EDITH ROSSITER, *Early Maryland Bookplates*, 310-314
Birnie, C., 96
Bishop, Liman (Luman), 309
Black, Judge James, 147
William, 150
Bladensburg, 179, 181, 182, 184
Blaine, James G., 319
Blair, Francis P., Sr., 26
Francis P. Jr., 26
Montgomery, 25-48, 152
Blake, Peter, the Immigrant, 338
Bland, Theodorick, 199, 203 *ff.*, 245
Bohn, Charles, 211, 216
Bolgiano, Francis W., 215
Bonaparte, Charles Jerome, 137
Bond, Judge Carroll T., 345
Peter, 203, 207, 209, 211, 214, 221, 223
Hugh Lennox, 34, 154, 155
Thomas, 314
Judge Thomas, 93
Tobias, 100
Bonifant, Washington, 29
Bookplates, 310-314
Bordley, John Beale, 355
Boteler, Jemima (Davis), Mrs. Walter, 275
Walter, 275
Boucher, (Jonathan), 52, 60
" Boulton," 335, 336, 338, 341
" Boulton Addition," 336
Bouquet, Gen. Henry, 273
Bourk, Dr. Thomas, 122
Bourne, H. R. Fox, 70
Bowdoin, Mrs. Henry J., 142, 144, 145
Bowie, Capt. Daniel, 82
Capt. Eversfield, 261
Lucy Leigh, 176, 238
BOWIE, LUCY LEIGH, *Madame Grelaud's French School*, 141-149
Bowie, Mary Eliza (Oden), Mrs. William Duckett, 264
Oden, 149, 150, 155
Gov. Oden, 264
Mrs. W. Beall, 143
Col. William Duckett, 264
Family, 263
Boyd, Julian P., 357

Bozman, John Leeds, 311
Bracco, Capt. Bennett, 82
Bradford, Gov. A. W., 31, 149, 152, 154, 156, 159, 161, 316, 321
Brady, Thomas M., Baltimore, 93
Brand, Rev. William F., 254, 255
Brawner, Mr., 215
Breckinridge, John C., 28
Rev. Robert J., 118
Brent, Mrs. Robert F., 4
Robert James, 245, 246
Brewer, James R., 150
Brice, Miss., 250
John, Jr., 9
Nicholas, 6
Bridges, E. W., 355
A Brief Summary of the Maryland Historical Society's Hundred Years, by Samuel K. Dennis, 1-5
Briers (Bryers), Lewis, 220
Brigham, Clarence S., *Edgar Allan Poe's Contributions to Alexander's Weekly Messenger*, 93
Briscoe, Col. James T., 149
Broadsides, Maryland Historical Society Collection of
" Abingdon and Cokesbury College," 118
" An Act to Incorporate the Baltimore Steam Packet Company," 125
" An Address to Robert Lemmon, Esq. by Luther Martin," 107
" Address to the Patrons of the Western Continent," 101
" An Appeal . . . to erect at old St. Mary's City . . . a memorial church . . . ," 118
" Articles for the Government of the Commercial Fire-Company of Baltimore," 109
" Articles for the Government of the Union Fire Company in Baltimore," 110
" Baltimore Assembly," 116
" Baltimore-Town, Committee-Chamber, Dec. 2, 1784," 111
" The Boot Black Boy's Address to his Patrons," 101
" Bridge Lottery," Conococheague River, 113
" A Brief Extract from the Proceedings of the Trustees of the Board of Agriculture for the Eastern Shore," 97
" The Case of the Lord Baltimore," 103
" Catalogue of the Faculty and Students of Dickinson College, Carlisle, December, 1811," 107
" A Caution to Purchasers," 96
" Chesapeake and Ohio Canal no. 3," 126
" Children of Zion," 119
" Conditions of Sale of the Right Honourable Lord Baltimore's Manors & Reserved Lands," 96
" Constitution and Bye-Laws of the Female Sabbath School Society of Easton, Maryland," 118
" Constitution for the Government of the Maryland Auxiliary Society, for Colonizing the Free People of Color . . . ," 120
" Constitution of the First Baltimore Hose Company," 110
" Constitution of the Maryland Society for Promoting Internal Improvement," 124
" Daniel in the Lions' Den," 119
" The Dying Christian," 119
" The Dying Saint," 119
" An Earnest and Direct Appeal to those Citizens of Baltimore . . . ," 112
" Election . . . of four delegates . . . [of] Baltimore County," 121
" Encampment of Knight Templars no. I Maryland," 117
" Exhibition and Fair, under the direction of the Maryland Agricultural Society," 1822, 96
" Extracts from an ordinance to mitigate the distress occasioned by the . . . fever," 103
" Facts! Facts,"! 118
" A Few Reasons in Support of the Annexed Plan for a ' Maryland State Bank ' . . . ," 125
" Freeman of Frederick County, Look at This,"! 100
" Friendly Hints in Various Subjects," 107
" General Agricultural and Horticultural Establishment . . . ," 97
" Good News," 119
" Great Surgical Lottery," 113
" Horn's Dying Speech," 117
" The Humble Address of Tobias Bond and Benjamin Welch," Before p. 95, 100
" Hymns to be sung at the Tenth Anniversary of the Reformed Church Sabbath Schools, Second Street," 119
" Judge Carmichael's Charge to the

Grand Jury of Talbot County on Arbitrary Arrests," 103
" Lectures on the Natural Sciences at the Baltimore Athenaeum," 116
" A Letter to James Lloyd Chamberlaine, Esq., of Talbot County," 122
" The Library Company of Baltimore," 116
" Lights along the Shore," 119
" List of Families and other persons residing in the Town of Baltimore . . . in the year 1752," 111
" List of Members of the Bible Society of Baltimore, Sept. 1815," 118
" List of Members of the Senate and House . . . ," 121
" A Lottery for disposing of a large and valuable collection of books, maps, etc.," 113
" Maryland Historical Society," 116
" Maryland Lottery to be drawn in Baltimore on the Havana Plan," 114
" The Old Town Clock," 119
" Order of Performance at the Ordination of Mr. Jared Sparks, to the Pastoral Care of the First Independent Church of Baltimore," 118
" An Ordinance to regulate the Inspection of Beef and Pork," 124
" A Pastoral Letter . . . of the Second Presbyterian Church . . . ," 118
" A pedantic PEDAGOGUE, suddenly metamorphosed into a GENERAL OF LAW . . . ," 107
" A Plan of the Female Humane Association Charity School," 117
" Please Read," 109
" The Poor of the Third Ward," 117
" Programma of the M. E. Sunday School Exhibition . . . June 11, 1849 . . . ," 118
" Proposals for Establishing a Circulating Library in Baltimore-Town," 99
" Prospectus. To the Patrons of the Eastern Shore Whig . . . ," 100
" Queries addressed to Robert Lemmon, Esq.," 107
" Queries to the Whigs of Maryland," 106
" Rates of Toll," 123
" Rates of Toll on the Susquehanna and Tide-Water Canals . . . ," 126
" Reply to the Baltimore Methodist Trustees," 118
" Retrenchment," 109
" Rules of the Frederick County Alms House, October, 1833," 117
" Rules to be observed by the Hands Employed in the Brick-Making Business . . . ," 97
" Sacred to the Memory of Gen. James M. Lingan," 99-100
" Samuel Chase and Thomas Chase—Deed of Cession, &c. to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore," 122, 124
" Sketch of the Life of Poor Old Moses," 120
" Snow Plow for rail and common roads," 125
" Song of the Sons of Temperance," 121
" Stop Thief. 25 Dollars Reward!," 122
" A Summary of all the monies received and paid . . . ," 111
" Table of Rates," 121
" Take Notice, the Friends of Philemon Towson . . . ," 121
" Take Notice, Two Ways only lead to this Shop, Charity or Money," 104
" A Testimony of the Baltimore Monthly Meeting . . . concerning . . . Elizabeth Thomas," 118
" 33,000 dollars Grand Consolidated Lottery of Maryland," 114
" To my Children," 118
" To my Fellow Citizens of Baltimore," 124
" To Robert Lemmon, Esq.," 107
" To Stephen Watters, Esq.," 126
" To the Citizens of Baltimore-Town," 103
" To the Citizens of Maryland," 116
" To the Citizens of Talbot," 108-109
" To the Convention of the P. E. Church of Maryland," 98
" To the Freemen of Frederick County," 100

"To the Honorable the Mayor and Members of the City Council of Baltimore," 125
"To the inhabitants of the Eastern Shore of Maryland," 107
"To the People of Baltimore," 99
"To the People of Calvert County," 106, 120
"To the People of Harford County," 104, 126
"To the People of Maryland," 113
"To the Polls! Freemen of Frederick County," 112
"To the Public," 103, 106, 107, 118
"To the Roman Catholic Voters in Baltimore Town," 118
"To the Voters of Baltimore," 101
"To the Voters of Baltimore City and County," 126
"To the Voters of the Eastern Shore of Maryland," 124
"To the Voters of Harford County," 100
"To the Voters of Talbot County," 1830, 108
"To the Voters of Talbot County," c. 1818, 112
"To the Working Men, Mechanics and others," 99
"To the Worthy Electors of Frederick County," 109
"Watchman's Address on the Return of Christmas, 1846," 101
"Walter Slicer's Inn, Twelve miles east of Cumberland," 121
Brobeck, Florence, 172
Brome, Dr. John M., 74
Brooks, James, 68 *ff.*
Brown, Capt. George I., 306
John, Raid of, 162-163
Ralph H., *Mirror for Americans: Likeness of the Eastern Seaboard*, reviewed, 89-90
Richard LeBaron, *The Providence Oath of Allegiance and First Signers*, reviewed, 92
William, 212
Browne, William Hand, 4
Bruce, William Cabell, 127
Brune, Anne Letitia (Coale), Mrs. J., 256
Frederick W., Sr., 240
Frederick W., Jr., 116, 240
John C., 240, 355
Bryant, William Cullen, and Gay, Sidney H., 74 *ff.*
Bryson, Capt. Andrew, 107
Buchanan, G., 116
James A., 202, 204 *ff.*, 218, 224, 303, 304
Smith and, 178
Buckler family, 88
"Buckroe," 344
Buell, Rev. David Hillhouse, 238, 239, 249
Walter, 38
Burckhardt, Jacob, *Force and Freedom: Reflections on History*, edited by J. H. Nichols, 93
Burgess, J. W., 283
Burke, David, 203, 209, 214, 218, 220, 223, 299
Burroughs, ———, (Tilghman), Mrs. Richard, 146
Burton, Mr., 132
Bussey, Edith (Philpot) Wilcoxen, Mrs. Matthew, 276
Bussey, Matthew, 276
Butler, Benjamin F., 38
Butterfield, J., 130

Cabell family, 88
Caldwell, E. B., 300
Calhoun, James, 202
Mayor James, 103
Callender, James, 90
Calvert, Benedict, 119
Charles Baltimore, 143, 315, 319, 320, 322, 323, 325, 331,
Elizabeth (Steuart), Mrs. George Henry, 352
George, of "Riversdale," 142, 144, 145
Mrs. George, 143-144
George Henry, 352, 353
Governor Leonard, 74, 76 *ff.*
Cameron, Simon, 36, 39
Camp, William, 203, 207, 209, 211, 220
Carlisle, Pa., 273
Carman, Harry J., 25, 94
William, 207, 210, 216
Carmichael, Judge Richard B., 103, 149
family, 88
Carr, James E., 150
Thomas, 96
Carroll, Charles, of Annapolis, 171
Charles, Barrister, 279
Charles, of Carrollton, 13, 171, 279
Charles, the Immigrant, 171, 311
Daniel (1730-1796), 171-172, 283 *ff.*
Daniel, of Duddington, 171
Daniel, of Mt. Dillon, 93
Eleanor (Carroll), Mrs. Daniel, 171
Eleanor (Darnall), 171

James, 312
Archbishop John, 6, 9, 19, 171
Thomas K., 158
Dr. Thomas King, 47
Carton, L. Roberts, 281
Mrs. L. Roberts, 277, 278, 280 *ff.*
" Catling's Plaine," 344
Caton, Richard, 6, 357
Catonsville, 356
Catrup, William Marsh, 105
The Centenary of the Cincinnati Observatory, November 5, 1943, 175
Chalmers, John, 206, 210, 216
Chamberlaine, James Lloyd, 122
Chambers, Judge Ezekiel F., 155, 157
Chandler, William E., 43, 44
Zachariah, 37
Chapman, Berlin S., *The Chapman Family; A Study in the Social Development of Central West Virginia*, 93
The Chapman Family; A Study in the Social Development of Central West Virginia, by Berlin S. Chapman, 93
Chappell, John, 118
Charles County Court records, 345-347
Charleston, S. C., 41-42
Charsty, Edward J., Jr., 150
Chase, Miss, of Annapolis, 147
Ann (Baldwin), Mrs. Samuel, 279
Elizabeth, 98
Hester Ann, 251
Hester (Baldwin), Mrs. Jeremiah Townley, 251, 279
Jeremiah Townley, 251, 279, 285, 287 *ff.*
Mathilde (Chase), Mrs. Thomas, 279
Rev. Richard, 279
Salmon P., 30 *ff.*
Samuel, 64, 96, 103, 118, 278, 279, 281, 283 *ff.*, 312
Thomas, 96, 98, 279
Thomas, of Samuel, 279
Chesapeake Cruise, edited by Norman Alan Hill, *reviewed*, 169-170
Chesley, Mary, 256
Rev. William F., 255
Chesney, Alan M., M. D. *The Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. Volume I: Early Years, 1867-1893*, reviewed, 164-165
Chesnut, Judge W. Calvin, *Some Addresses—The By-Product of a Federal Judge*, reviewed, 353-354
Emma, 146
Cheston, Dr. James, 257
Sally Scott (Murray), Mrs. James, 257
Chew, Mr., 239
Frances (Holland), Mrs. Richard, 260
Leonard Hollyday, 260
Philemon, 260, 261
Maj. Richard, 260
Christian Advocate and Journal, Baltimore, 100
" A Church of England Planter " (pseud.), 59
Church Point, St. Mary's County, 74
Civil Service Reformer, 137
CIVILIAN DEFENSE IN BALTIMORE, 1814-1815, edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., 199-224, 293-309
Clagett, Adeline (Hodges) Mundell, Mrs. Thomas, 260
Thomas, 260
Clapham, John, 53, 56
Clark, Charles Branch, 176, 358
CLARK, CHARLES BRANCH, *Politics in Maryland during the Civil War*, 149-161, 315-331
Robert, 336, 340
Clarke, Daniel, 149
Mary Patterson, *Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies*, reviewed, 91-92
Clayton, James W., 47
Clifton, Josephine, 355
Clopham (Clapham), Jonas, 211
Clothier, Robert, 337, 340
Coale, Edward J., 98, 114, 116, 256
Cochrane, Admiral Sir Alexander, 185
Cock, John, 341
Cockburn, Admiral Sir George, 144
The Coffee House, Baltimore, 99
Cohen, Jacob I., 114
Cokayne, Sarah (Kemp), Mrs. Thomas, 339, 340
Thomas, 339, 340
Cole, Arthur C., 25
Philip, 102
Colhoon, Mr. 243
——— (Ireland), Mrs. 243
Collison, Elizabeth (Kemp), Mrs. George, 337, 340
George (fl. 1696), 336, 337, 340
Collyer, Dr., 104
Columbia (steamer), 125
" Compton," 344
Conditional Union Party, 31
Confiscated British Property, Journal of the Comm'rs of, 285
Conine's Lottery Office, 113, 115
Conkling, Roscoe, 321
Conn, Daniel, 206, 210, 216
Conner, Daniel, 205, 296
Conrad, Robert T., 280

Considerations on the Propriety . . . . Dulany pamphlet, 58
Constitutional Union party, 28 *ff.*
CONTROVERSY OVER THE COMMAND AT BALTIMORE, IN THE WAR OF 1812, by Ralph Robinson, 177-198
Cooper, Calvin, 210
Corey, Giles, 165-166
Corkran, Francis S., 29, 30, 33
Courtney, Miss, 239
Cowdry, Bartlett, 354
Cox, Dr. Christopher C., 155, 158
Capt. Walter, 83
Craig, Mrs. Henry, 294-295
Crane, William B., 170
"Crazy Jakes," 355
Creswell, John A. J., 32 *ff.*, 155, 157, 315, 318, 327, 328
Crisfield, John W., 315, 318, 321 *ff.*
Crittenden, Christopher, and Godard, Doris, editors, *Historical Societies in the United States and Canada: A Handbook*, 357
Crocker, Rowland Robinson, 93
Cumberland *Independent*, 100
Cunmiller, Philip, 207, 210, 216
Cunz, Dieter, 30
Curson, (Curzon) R., 116
Curts, Mr. 303
Custis, Eleanor (Calvert), Mrs. John Parke, 142
Mrs. Eliza, Before 141

Dabney, Miss, 147
Benjamin, 148
Daily Exchange, Baltimore, 129
Daily Republican and Argus, Baltimore, 101
Daniel Carroll, A Framer of the Constitution, by Sister Mary Virginia Geiger, *reviewed*, 171-172
Dartmouth, Lord, 67
Davidson, John, 107
Davis, David, 28, 43
Henry Winter, 25-48, 150 *ff.*, 316, 317, 319, 327
Jefferson, 91, 329
Dawson, John, 103
"Dawson's Fortune," 344
Deale, Capt. James, 253
Dearborn, Maj. Gen. John, 178, 185
deButts, Judge John, 93
Decker, George, 207, 211, 216
DeCourcey, Lieut. Edward, 84
DeFauvel (DeFouvel), Lt. Col., 297-298
DeFourville, Maj., 217
Delancy, James, 69, 70
Delphian Club, 20
Delaplaine, Edward S., 292
Delaware's Forgotten Folk, by C. A. Weslager, *reviewed*, 86
Democratic party, 25 *ff.*, 149, 150, 152, 155 *ff.*
Denison, Gen. Andrew W., 46
Dennett, Tyler, 39, 40, 43
Dennis, Judge Samuel K., 94
DENNIS, SAMUEL K., *A Brief Summary of the Maryland Historical Society's Hundred Years*, 1-5
Dent, Lieut. George, 83, 84,
Col. John F., 149
Deptford Fire Company, Fells Point, Baltimore, 111
The Development of the Colonial Newspaper, by Sidney Kobre, *reviewed*, 270
Diamond, William, *The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson*, 92
Dickinson, John, 58
Dickson, Harold Edward, editor, *Observations on American Art: Selections from the Writings of John Neal (1793-1876)*, reviewed, 166-167
Dielman, Louis H., 4, 175
Diffenderfer, Daniel, 212
Peter, 212
A DISCORDANT CHAPTER IN LINCOLN'S ADMINISTRATION: THE DAVIS BLAIR CONTROVERSY, by Reinhard H. Luthin, 25-48
Divers, Ananias, 120
Dix & Fogg, 241
Dixon, Elizabeth (Kemp), Mrs. John, 338-339, 340
John, 338-339, 340
Dodson, Robert, 103
Dolan, John J., 281
Doolittle, James R., 27
Dorsey, Mr., 302
Messrs., 285
Caleb, 246
Col. Charles Samuel Worthington, 246
Edward, of Kentucky, 246
G. Volney, 39
John Worthington, Jr., 246
Thomas, 286
Judge Thomas Beale, 246
Douglas, Gen. (George), 184, 196, 223, 303
Stephen A., 28
Downes, Philemon St. John, 93
Dubreul, Rev. Fr., 128
Ducker, Jeremiah, 96
Dugan, Cumberland, 199, 203, 208, 215, 301
Duke, Su:. 93
Dukehart, Valerius, 98

Dulany, Benjamin, 67
Daniel, 53, 58, 66 *ff.*, 279
Capt. Grafton, 67
Lloyd, 67 *ff.*, 106, 279
Walter, 49 *ff.*, 106
Dunbar, Dr. John R. W., 240
Dunlap, Leslie W., *American Historical Societies, 1790-1860*, reviewed, 273
DuPont, Henry A., 42
Rear Adm. Samuel F., 41 *ff.*
Durang, Mr. F., 294
Durham, Lloyd, 96
Duvall, Judge Gabriel, 281, 314

Earle, James T., 133
Early Catonsville and the Caton Family, by George C. Keidel, *reviewed*, 356-357
The Early History of the Stricklands of Sizergh, by S. Lee Washington, 93
EARLY MARYLAND BOOKPLATES, by Edith Rossiter Bevan, 310-314
" East St. Mary's," St. Mary's Co., 74
Eastern High School, Committee of the Faculty of, *Through the Years at the Eastern High School*, reviewed, 173-174
Ebeling, Christophe Daniel, 89
The Economic Thought of Woodrow Wilson, by William Diamond, 92
Eddis, William, 57
Eden, Sir Robert, 57, 67
Edgar Allan Poe's Contributions to Alexander's Weekly Messenger, by Clarence S. Brigham, 93
Edmondson, Horatio, 142
James, 343
" Edmondson's Lower Cove," 344
Edwards, Jonathan, 19
Egerton, Hugh, 67
Elder, Rev. Fr. Alexis, 127, 128
Ellicott, Elias, 199, 202, 208
James, 212
Ellicott's Mills, 244 *ff.*
Elliot, Jonathan, II, 286, 289, 290
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 353
The English Geographers and the Anglo-American Frontier in the Seventeenth Century, by Fulmer Mood, *reviewed*, 272
Ernest, Caleb, 207
Charles, 220
Essary, J. Frederick, 25, 319
Etting, Solomon, 199, 202, 208, 209, 296, 301, 302
Eubank, Jane (Kemp) Clothier, Mrs. Thomas, 337, 340
Thomas, 337, 340
Evans, Capt., 301
French S., 30
Samuel M., 46
Evans Inn, 353
Eveleth, Mrs. James, 265
Kate, 265, 266
Everson, Ida Gertrude, *George Henry Calvert, American Literary Pioneer*, reviewed, 352-353
Ewing, Thomas, 130, 131
William P., 29

The Family of Bray Wilkins, "Patriarch of Will's Hill," of Salem (Middleton) Mass., by William Carroll Hill, 93
Fanny (vessel), 170
Farnandis, William, 135
Fazakerly, J., 64, 69
Federal Gazette, Baltimore, 16, 101
Fernandis, Capt. James, 83, 84
Fessenden (William Pitt), 318
Fifty Years in a Maryland Kitchen, by Jane (Gilmor) Howard, revised by Florence Brobeck, *reviewed*, 172-173
Findlay, John Van Lear, 137, 317
Fisher, John, 93
Josephine, 94, 169
FISHER, JOSEPHINE, *Bennet Allen, Fighting Parson*, 49-72
Fisher, Robert, 210, 216
Fitzhugh, George, 175
William, 175
Mrs. William H., 332
Fleming, Walter L., 27
Fletcher, Charlotte, 332
Flower, Milton Embick, and Flower, Lenore Embick, *This Is Carlisle: A History of a Pennsylvania Town*, reviewed, 273
Fogg, Dix and, 241
Fonerden, Adam, 202, 207, 208, 211
Footner, Hulbert, 170
Hulbert, *Rivers of the Eastern Shore: Seventeen Maryland Rivers*, reviewed, 351-352
Force, Peter, 62, 67, 81
Force and Freedom: Reflections on History, by Jacob Burckhardt, edited by J. H. Nichols, 93
Ford, P(aul) L(eicester), 283
Fourierism, 353
Forman, Henry Chandlee, 74, 75
Ft. McHenry, 181, 188 *ff.*, 223, 297, 298
Fort Warren, Boston, 132, 133
Foster, James W., 4, 277, 357

Fountain Inn, Baltimore, 99, 241
Four Late Eighteenth Century Anglo-American Landscape Painters, by J. Hall Pleasants, *reviewed*, 349-351
"Fowling Creek," 344
Fox, Gustavus V., 41 *ff.*
Franciscus, George, 203
Franklin, Benjamin, 66, 286
Fabian, 136
George E., 253
Thomas, 247
Franklin Fire Company, 111
Frasure, Carl M., 28
Frazier, Alexander, 93, 314
Alexander, 93, 314
John, Jr., 33
William, 122
Frederick County, 112
Frederick Examiner, 155, 160, 315-316, 318, 319
Frederick Female Seminary, 108
Frederick-Town Herald, 100
Freedmen's Bureau, 328
Freeman, George, 355
Frémont, John C., 37, 38, 152
French, John C., 21
Frick, Dr. George, 215
Frisby, Richard, 203 *ff.*, 209, 216, 219 *ff.*, 295, 303, 309
Fry, Samuel, 297
Fuess, Claude M., 41
Fuller, Margaret, 353
William, 336
Fulton, Edington, 46

Gaither, Bvt. Maj. Henry, 83, 84
Henry H., 93
Gale, George, 286, 289
Henrietta Maria, 147
Levin, 147
Galloway, Samuel, 56
Gambrill, J. Montgomery, 166
Gannt, Mrs. Elizabeth, 162, 163
Gardiner, Major, 251
Dr. Charles Llewellyn, 145
Eliza Caroline (Leigh), Mrs. Charles Llewellyn, 145 *ff.*
Gardner, George, 272
Garratt, Mr., of Sykesville, 238
Garrett family, 88
Garrison, William Lloyd, 175
Gary, Stephen, 342, 343
Gascoyne, Bamber, 64, 69 *ff.*
Gatchell, Jeremiah, 215, 294
Gates, Gen., 62
Geiger, Sister Mary Virginia, *Daniel Carroll, A Framer of the Constitution*, reviewed, 171-172
General Wayne Tavern, Baltimore, 102
Gentleman's Magazine, London, 70, 71
George Fitzhugh, Propagandist of the Old South, by Harvey Wish, *reviewed*, 175
George Henry Calvert, American Literary Pioneer, by Ida Gertrude Everson, 352-353, *reviewed*
Gibson, Hannah (Thompson) Rowe, Mrs. James, 94
James, 94
William, 123
Gill, Ann E. (Deale), Mrs. John, 253
George M., 133
John, 253
Richard W., 253
Gillett, Ransom H., 130
Gilliss, Hamlet, 96
John, 96
Gilman, Daniel Coit, 129, 136, 137, 183, 185
Gilmor, Robert, 6, 350, 355
Girard, Stephen, 142, 143
Glenn, John (d. 1853), 128-129
John (1829-1896), 129, 138
John M., 129
William Wilkins, 129
Gliddon, George R., 116
Godard, Doris, *see* Crittenden, Christopher, and Godard, Doris
Goddard, Mary Katherine, 99, 107, 122
William, 99, 270
Godefroy, Maximilian, 355
Godwin, Parke, 152
Gohdes, Clarence, *American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England*, 175
Gold, Peter, 207, 210, 216
Goldsborough, Gov. Charles, 332-334
Henry Howe, 154, 155
Mary Emerson (Trippe), Mrs. Robert, 313
Nicholas, 146
Robert (fl. 1772), 313
Robert H., 97
William, 333, 334
Goodwin, William, 119
Gordon, Alexander, Jr., 198
Capt. James, R. N., 183, 185
Gorman, Arthur Pue, 139, 140
Gott, Mrs., 257
Gough, Mrs. Prudence, 313
Goulbourn, J., 62, 63
Gould, Mrs. William D., 332
Gourdon, Ferdinando, 211, 216
GOVERNOR CHARLES GOLDSBOROUGH'S VIEWS ON SLAVERY, 332-334
Gracy, John, 210, 216
Graham, Samuel A., 159

Grant, Gen. Ulysses S., 85, 269
McCandless and Stenson, (innkeepers), 121
Graves, Anna Melissa, "*I Have Tried to Think and Other Papers*," 93
Gray, Rev. J. B., 118
John T., 150
Greeley, Horace, 152
Green, Mrs. 294
Ann Catherine, Mrs. Jonas, 53
Frederick, 98, 107
Jonas, 98
Greenway, Mrs. William, 355
Grelaud, Arthur, 142
Madame Deborah, 141-149
John, 142, 146
Titon, 142
Grieves, H. C., 120
Grigsby, Hugh B., 291
Grimes, Elizabeth M., 45
Griswold, B. Howell, Jr., 3
Groombridge, William, 350
Groome, Elizabeth (Black), Mrs. John Charles, 147
James Black, 147
Col. John Charles, 147
Gross, John, 210, 216
"Groveland," Carroll County, 241, 243
Guinand, Henry, 93
Guy, Francis, 350

Hale, John P., 42 *ff.*
Halkerstone, Lieut. John, 83
Hall, Clayton Colman, editor, 73
Ed., 256
Harry, 257
John, 279
Hallam, Mr. (Lewis), 7
Halsey, Mrs. Anna M., 275
Halstead, Murat, 27
Hambleton, Alexander, 104, 105
Samuel, 105, 317
Samuel, Jr., 108
Hamer, P. M., 277
Hamersley, Hugh, 49, 50, 53, 54, 58, 59
Hamilton, Dr. Alexander, 56
S. M., 185
Hammond, John, Annapolis, 52
Mathias, 279
Hampstead Hill, Baltimore, 188, 206
Handelian Charitable Society, 117
Hanson, Alexander Contee, 108, 283, 285 *ff.*
George, 94
John, Jr., 63, 64
Jonathan, 80
Harbison, Winfred A., 39
Harden, Miss, 146
Harford, Frances Mary, 69
Henry, 69
Harlan, Judge Henry D., 354
Harris, Benjamin G., 155, 158, 315, 319 ff.
D., 116
Col. David, 301
David, 6
Edward, 207, 211, 216
J. Morrison, 2
Sally, 147
Mrs. Samuel, 294
W. Hall, 2
W. Hall, Jr., 2
Harrison, Ann Caroline (Harwood), Mrs. Benjamin, 246
Benjamin, 246
Elizabeth Catharine (Thompson), Mrs. Hugh T., 244
Rev. Hugh T., 244, 268
J. E., 76
Samuel A., 106
Capt. William, 82, 83
Haslam, John Buckly, 143
Hart, Albert Bushnell, 39
Harwood, Henry, 207, 210, 216
——— (Lloyd), Mrs. Henry Hall, 247, 248, 253
Peter, Jr., 338, 340
Susannah (Kemp) Stewart, Mrs. Peter Jr., 338, 340
Hawkins, William, 207, 211, 216
Hawley, Rev. Mr., 266
Hay (John) Nicolay (John G.) and, 36, 43
Hayden, Edwin Parsons, 245
Horace H., 245
Hayes, John, 11
Heiskell, J. Monroe, 138 *ff.*
Heitman, Francis B., 82
Helfenstein, Ernest, 60, 71
Hellman, Andrew, 117
Hemphill, Antoinette (Girard), Mrs. John, 143
John, 143
Henderson, Louisa (Patterson), Mrs. Robert R., 162
Henry, Patrick, 292
Herara, Anita, Mme. Isabella (Bell), 146
Herring, Ludwig, 207, 210, 216, 297
Hewitt, Eli, 207, 210, 216
Rev. Nathaniel Augustus, 239
Hertz, Emanuel, 46
Hervey, John, *Racing in America, 1665-1865*, reviewed, 347-349
Heuisler, Joseph S., 150
Heyward, Gen. William H., 119

Hickman, John, 328, 329
Nathaniel, 98
Hicks, Thomas H., 30, 34, 40, 45, 315 *ff.*
Hickson, George, 80
Hignet (Hignat), John, 207, 211, 216
Hill, Norman Alan, editor, *Chesapeake Cruise*, reviewed, 169-170
Hill, William Carroll, *The Family of Bray Wilkins, "Patriarch of Will's Hill," of Salem (Middleton) Mass.*, 93
Hilliary, Mr., 262
Hindman, Capt. Edward, 83
Rev. Samuel, 118
THE HISTORIC MULBERRY TREE OF SAINT MARY'S CITY, by William B. Marye, 73-80
Historical Societies in the United States and Canada: A Handbook, compiled and edited by Christopher Crittenden . . . and Doris Godard, *reviewed*, 357
Hite, Robert G., 195
Hodges, Benjamin, 262
John, 262
Rebecca (Berry), 262
Dr. Thomas Ramsey, 260
Hodgkins, Lucy (Brooke), Mrs. Thomas, 260
(Hodkins), Mr. Thomas, 260
Hoffman, Henry W., 26, 29, 32, 34, 40, 45, 151
Holland, Col. John G., 155, 158, 319
William H., 158
Hollingsworth, Jesse, 242, 243
Samuel, 199, 202, 208, 211, 221
Mrs. Samuel, 294
Sophia (Baker), Mrs. Jesse, 243
Hollins, John, 202, 295
Hollyday, Ann (Bennett), Mrs. Henry, 274
Frederic, 274
Henry, 146, 274
James, 275
Margaretta (Goldsborough), Mrs. Henry, 146
Richard C., 274
Holton, Hart B., 159
Hope, Thomas, 100
Hopkinson, Francis, 284, 286
Hosmer, John K., 36
Howard, Charles Morris, 127
Francis Key, 133
Mrs. J. Spence, 75
Jane (Gilmor), Mrs. Benjamin Chew, *Fifty Years in a Maryland Kitchen*, revised by Florence Brobeck, 172-173
John Eager, 13, 181 *ff.*, 199, 203, 205, 293, 296, 299, 355
Mrs. John Eager, 295
John Eager, Jr., 96, 181
Howell, William H., 164
Howland, Daniel, 207
Hoyt, William D., Jr., 91, 94, 172, 272, 276, 358
HOYT, WILLIAM, D., JR., ed., *A List of Promotions in the Maryland Regular Troops*, 81-84
HOYT, WILLIAM D., JR., editor, *Civilian Defense in Baltimore, 1814-1815*, 199-224, 293-309
Hudson, Lieut. Hooper, 83
Huffington family, 342
Hull, Isaac, 185
Morris N. B., 102
Humphreys, Rev. Hector, 247 *ff.*
Hunt, Gaillard, 186
Jesse, 110
Hunter, Robert Jr., 335
Hurst, John E., 139
Huston, James F., 100
Hutton, James, 207, 210, 216
Orlando, 280
Perry, 102
Hyde, John (London), 171

"I Have Tried to Think and Other Papers," by Anna Melissa Graves, 93
Iglehart, James, 253
Iglehart, *see* Swan & Iglehart's City Hotel, Annapolis
Independent Citizen, Bel Air, 100
Indian King Inn, Baltimore, 121
Indians, 86
Ingersoll, Charles J., 184
International Bearings of American Policy, by Albert Shaw, 92
Ireland, Edward, Sr., 242
Irvine, Alexander, 211, 216
Irwin & Company, 114

Jackson, R. H., 34
Jakes, Frederick, 355
Henry, 355
James, Macgill, 351
Jameson, Dr. Horatio, 215
Jamison, Joseph, 203, 208, 218, 295, 299, 303
Penelope (Westcott), Mrs. T. Worth, 88
Jarrett, A. Lingan, 155
Jefferson, Mr., 294
Thomas, 128, 185, 284, 286, 292, 349, 354, 358
Jefferson and the Press, by Frank L. Mott, *reviewed*, 90
Jenifer, Daniel of St. Thomas, 54, 55, 80, 84, 96, 108, 281, 283

Jenkins, Capt. Thomas C., 221
Jennings, Dr. S. K., 104
Jessop, William, 199, 202, 207, 208, 209, 211, 217, 218, 221, 304, 305
Jewett, Frank B., 276
JEWETT, FRANK B., *One Hundred Years of Electrical Communication in the United States*, 225-236
John Brickwood (Ship), 12
The Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, A Chronicle. Volume I, by Alan M. Chesney, M. D., rev., 164-165
Johnson, Pres. Andrew, 47, 48, 151
  Beulah J., 275
  Mayor Edward, Baltimore, 181, 182, 204 *ff.*, 295
  Monroe, 281
  Reverdy, 153, 154, 315, 317 *ff.*
  Thomas, 279, 287 *ff.*
Johnston, Augusta, 146
  Richard Malcolm, 134-135
Jones, Joshua, 202
  Richard H., 212
  T., 103
  Virgil Carrington, *Ranger Mosby*, reviewed, 269-270
  William, 207, 211, 216
  William J., 47
Judah, Martin, 117
Jump, Robert J., 155

Karen Long, Medical Technician, by Mary Ellis Turner, 274
Kedge's Straits, Battle of, 351
Keidel, George C., *Early Catonsville and the Caton Family*, reviewed, 356-357
Kelso, John, 203, 204, 207, 211, 216, 221, 304
Kemp, Benjamin, 338 *ff.*
  Caroline (Thomas), Mrs. Robert, 340, 341
  Constant, 337, 340
  Edmund, 337, 340
  Eleanor, 340, 341
  Elizabeth, 337, 338, 340
  Elizabeth (Hardcastle), Mrs. Samuel Troth, 340, 341
  Elizabeth (Harwood) Williams, Mrs. James, 338, 340
  Elizabeth (Webb), Mrs. Robert, 336, 340, 341
  Elizabeth (Wilson), Mrs. Thomas, 340, 341
  Golfred, 335
  Henry, 340, 341
  Bp. James, 19
  James, 338 *ff.*
  James, Jr., 338, 340
  Jane, of William, 337, 340
  John, Abp. of Canterbury, 336
  John I, 336, 337, 340
  John II, 337-338, 340, 343
  John III, 338, 339, 340
  John IV, 335, 339, 340, 341
  John V, 339-341
  Joseph, 338 *ff.*
  Magdaline (Stevens), Mrs. John II, 337-338, 340, 343
  Maria (Lambdin), Mrs. John, 339, 340
  Martha, 337, 340
  Martha (Eubank), Mrs. William, 337, 340
  Mary, 338, 340
  Mary, 340, 341
  Mary (Ball), Mrs. John, 336-337, 340
  Mary (Wrightson), Mrs. John, 338, 339, 340
  Phoebe, 340, 341
  Rachel, 337, 340
  Rachel (Denny), Mrs. Thomas, 339, 340
  Robert, 335, 336, 338 *ff.*
  Samuel, 338, 340
  Dr. Samuel Troth, 341, 340
  Sarah, 337, 340
  Sarah (Powell), Mrs. Robert, 339, 340
  Sarah Pascall (Troth), Mrs. John, 335, 339, 340
  Susan (Lambdin), Mrs. John, 339, 340
  Susannah (Yarnall), Mrs. Samuel Troth, 340, 341
  Thomas, Bp. of London, 336
  Thomas, 338 *ff.*
  William, 337, 340
  family, 335-341
Kennedy, Anthony, 315, 316, 320 *ff.*
  Florence J., 277
  John P., 20, 128
Kent, Emmanuel, 203
  Frank Richardson, 156, 157
  Mrs. James, 256-257
Kerr, John Leeds, 146
Key, Francis Scott, 20
  Philip Barton, 68
Keyser, Mrs. H. Irvine, 3, 355
  William, 138, 139
Keystone, Thomas Pownall, 89
Kilbourn, Diana T., 108
Kilty, John, 98
Kimmel, William, 150, 156, 158
King, Edward S., 167
  Rufus, 292

Kingsmore, John, 303
Kitty (ship), 107
Knott, Aloysius Leo, 32, 34, 150, 156, 158 *ff.*
Know-nothing Party, *see also* American Party
Kohlmeier, A. L., 277
Kobre, Sidney, *The Development of the Colonial Newspaper*, reviewed, 270

Ladew, Harvey S., 349
Lafayette, General (Marquis de) 90
Lane, Maj. 196
Latrobe, Mayor Ferdinand C., 134
John H. B., 112
Law, Anthony, 94
Catherine (Shryer) Bausman, Mrs. Anthony, 94
Eliza Parke (Custis), Mrs. Thomas, 142 *ff.*
Thomas, 142
Leakin, S. C., 121
Lear, Frances Dandridge (Henley), Mrs. Tobias, 145
Tobias, 145
Leary, Cornelius L. L., 315, 321, 322, 325, 331
Leaves from an Old Washington Diary, 1854-1863, by Elizabeth Lindsay Lomax, *reviewed*, 87-88
Lechford, Sir Richard, 78
Lee, Mary (Custis), Mrs. Robert Edward, opposite 141
Gen. Robert E., 85, 87
Adm. S. Phillips, 41
Leigh, John, 145
Leland, Thomas, 93
Lemmon, Dr. Robert, 106, 107
LETTERS OF SEVERN TEACKLE WALLIS, 1816-1894, by Frederick Dent Scott, S. J., 127-140
Levering, Capt. Aaron R., 308
Lewis, Richard, 219
Leypold, Frederick, 207, 210, 216
Libby, Orin Grant, 283, 284, 287, 291
THE LIBRARY COMPANY OF BALTIMORE, 1795-1854, by Stuart C. Sherman, 6-24
A Life of Travels, by C[onstantine] S[amuel] Rafinesque. (*Chronica Botanica, Vol. 8, Number 2.*), reviewed, 271-272.
Lillington, Rev. Mr., 337
Lincoln, Abraham, 25, 27 *ff.*, 149 *ff.*, 317, 320, 321, 324, 329
Lincoln, Mrs. William W., 358
Lindenberger, Jacob, 265
William, 239
Lingan, Gen. James M., 99-100
A LIST OF PROMOTIONS IN THE MARYLAND REGULAR TROOPS, edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., 81-84
Lloyd, Richard Bennett, 312
Local History: How to Gather It, Write It, and Publish It, by Donald Dean Parker, *reviewed*, 357
Lomax, Elizabeth Lindsay, *Leaves from an Old Washington Diary*, reviewed, 87-88
Maj. Mann Page, 87
Long, Francis T., 134
Robert Cary, 200, 211 *ff.*, 305, 355
Long Island, Battle of, 81, 82
" Long Neck," 338
Loockerman, Dr. Jacob, 343
Magdaline (Stevens) Edmondson, Mrs. Jacob L., 343
Lorman, William, 199, 202, 207, 209, 211, 221, 300, 303, 304
Mrs. William, 295
Love, John, 282
Lovejoy, Owen, 329, 330
Lowe, Gov. Enoch Louis, 102
Loyalist Transcripts, 59, 61 *ff.*
Lucas, Fielding, Jr., 116
Luthin, Reinhard H., 94
LUTHIN, REINHARD H., *A Discordant Chapter in Lincoln's Administration: the Davis-Blair Controversy*, 25-48
Lynch, Dr., 317
Capt. John, 221
Lyons, Samuel, 124

McCandless, ———, 121
McCarthy, Charles H., 31
McClary, William, 207, 210, 216
McClellan, Gen. George B., 36, 37, 150, 152, 157
McClure, J. A. L., 150
McCullough, Hiram, 157
McDaniel, Talbot Co., 335
McDonald, Alexander, 207, 210, 216, 295
MacDonald (Alexander) & Ridgely (Nicholas), 295
C. S. & Company, 114
McGill, Mr. 56
Macgill, George, 111
M'Hard, ——— (innkeeper), 121
McHenry, James, 283 *ff.*
McKendree, Bishop (William), 119
McKenzie, Dr. Colin, 201, 208, 215
McKim, Mrs. Isaac, 295
John, Jr., 207, 210, 216
Robert, 104
McKubbin, Richard, 253
MacKubin, George, 109
McLane, Cornelius, 247
MacLeish, Archibald, 1

Maclin, Littleton, 159
McMahon, John Van Lear, 109
"Mable," 337
"Mable's Addition," 337
"Machiavel" (pseud.), 57, 58
Machenheimer, Rev. George Lindenberger, 262 *ff.*
Mackenheimer, John, 216, 221
MADAME GRELAUD'S FRENCH SCHOOL, by Lucy Leigh Bowie, 141-149
Maddox, Dora, 75
G. Frederick, 133
Madison, James, 185, 186, 192, 284, 287, 293, 302 *ff.*
Magruder, Miss, 143, 144
Magruder, "Lawyer," ———, 253, 254
Denis, 143
Maher, Col. Martin, 305
Mann, George, 121
Marbury, William, 108
Marden, Jesse, 98
Marine, Harriet P., 4
William M., 202
Marshall, William L., 27, 29
Martin, Daniel, 97
Edward O., 105
Luther, 106, 282, 283 *ff.*
Thomas P., 277
William Bond, 313
Martindale, Price, 105
Marye, ——— (Tilghman), Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 146
William B., 94, 272, 356
MARYE, WILLIAM B., *The Historic Mulberry Tree of Saint Mary's City*, 73-80
Marshall, John, 19
Maryland Gazette, Annapolis, 50, 52, 53, 56, 58 *ff.*, 113, 270, 279, 287 *ff.*
Maryland Gazette; or, the Baltimore Advertiser, 285
Maryland Historical Society, A Brief Summary of the Hundred Years of, 1-5
Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, 67, 270, 290
Maryland Line, Promotions in, 81-84
Maryland Loyalist Regiment, 67
A MARYLAND TOUR IN 1844: DIARY OF ISAAC VAN BIBBER, 237-268
Maryland Union, Frederick, 318, 323
Mason, Mrs., 294
George, 292
Master(s), Legh, 109, 237
Mather, Cotton, 19
Maulsby, William P., 155
Maxwell, ———, 221, 306
May, Henry, 315, 319, 321, 322, 325, 329, 331
Mayer, Brantz, 23, 101, 116
Charles F., 131
Frank B., 355
Maynadier, Capt., 267
Mrs., 267
(Manadier), Col. Henry, 252
Mechanical Fire Company, 110
Medford, Richard Carl, 90, 170
Melendy, Peter, 175
Mercantile Library Association, 21, 23
Mercer, John Francis, 171, 283, 284, 287
Merrill, Dr. E. D., 271
Merritt, Elizabeth, 92, 357
Merryman, Joseph, 80
Middleton, Dr. James, 215
Miles, Edward, 219
Miller, Alfred J., 355
Jacob, 210, 216
Oliver, 149
Milnor, Mary W., 4
Minis, Miss, 147
Dwina (Cohen), Mrs. Isaac, 148
Isaac, 148
Mirror for Americans: Likeness of the Eastern Seaboard, by Ralph H. Brown, *reviewed*, 89-90
Missouri—Day by Day, by Floyd C. Shoemaker, 274
Mitchell, Arthur, 206, 210, 216
Mondesir, John, 9
Monroe, James, 178, 185 *ff.*, 293, 300, 307
Montague, Duke of, 64
Mood, Fulmer, *The English Geographers and the Anglo-American Frontier in the Seventeenth Century*, reviewed, 272
Moore, Charles, 38, 142
James, Sr., 275
Mary, 275
Moran, Mr., 216
Moreland, Hanson Bradley, 358
Sarah (Adkins), Mrs. Hanson Bradley, 358
Morning Chronicle and Baltimore Advertiser, 101, 102
Morning Post, London, 66, 68, 71
Morrill, Justin S., 26
Morris, Caroline Maria (Calvert), Mrs. Thomas Willing, 142, 144, 145
Dr. John, 150
Richard B., 347
Robert, 69, 70
Thomas Willing, 145
Morrison, Jesse, 150
Morse, Samuel F. B., 225
Morsell, Rev. Joshua, 255, 257
Mortimer, Thomas, 222
Mosby, Col. John, 269
Mosher, James, 212

Mott, Frank L., *Jefferson and the Press*, reviewed, 90
" Mt. Dillon," Baltimore Co. 93
Mt. Pleasant Ferry, Patuxent River, 258-259
" Mt. Royal," 80
Mulberry Tree, St. Mary's City, 73-80
Mundell, Dr. Benjamin, 260
Mundle, William, 212
Munroe, T., 94
Murdock, William, Esqr., 9
Murray, Daniel, 257
Mary Dorsey, Mrs. Daniel, 257
Mustard, Mrs. Wilfred P., opp. 141
" My Lady's Manor," 96
Myers, Jacob, 202
William Starr, 31, 157, 161

Namier, L. B., 70
National Academy of Design Exhibition Record, 1826-1860, reviewed, 354-355
Neal, John, 20, 166
Nevins, Allan, 36
New Market Fire Company, 110
New Viewpoints in Georgia History, by Albert B. Saye, reviewed, 174
The New World: or, the Morning and Evening Gazette, 10
New York Evening Post, 152
New York *Herald*, 28, 31, 41 *ff.*
New York *Independent*, 152
New York Post, 316
New York Tribune, 152
Newcastle and Frenchtown Rail-road, 124
Nichols, James Hastings, editor, *Force and Freedom: Reflections on History*, by Jacob Burckhardt, 93
Nicholls, Gov., New York, 348, 349
Nicholson, Capt. Joseph H., 195, 305
Nicolay (John G.), and Hay (John), 36, 43
Niles, Hezekiah, 99
Niles' Weekly Register, 101
Norris, Mary (Kemp), Mrs. Thomas, 339, 340
Thomas, 339, 340
North, Lord, 64
" North Bend," Talbot Co., 335
Norwood's Ferry Bridge, 123
Null, Jacob, 238

Obrecht, Everett D., 292
Observation, Frederick Committee of, 61-62
Observations on American Art: Selections from the Writings of John Neal (1793-1876), edited by Harold Edward Dickson, *reviewed*, 166-167
Ogilby, John, 272
Oglethorpe, James, 174
Ogsden, John, 212
ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATION IN THE UNITED STATES, by Frank B. Jewett, 225-236
Otis, James, 58
Owen, Richard, 19
Sally, 256
Oxford, Talbot Co., 342

Paca, William, 279, 282, 287 *ff.*, 353
Paine, Thomas, 19
Palmer, T. H., 195
Parker, Donald Dean, *Local History: How to Gather It, Write It, and Publish It*, reviewed, 357
Parks, William, 207, 210, 216
Parliamentary Privilege in the American Colonies, by Mary Patterson Clarke, *reviewed*, 91-92
Partridge, James R., 30
Patapsco Fire Company, 110
Patterson, George, 242
Mr. & Mrs. Thomas Leiper, 162, 163
William, 96, 120, 199, 202, 293, 301, 303
Paul, John, 303, 305
John Gilman D'Arcy, 173
Paullin, Charles O., 41 *ff.*
Payne, John Howard, 20
Payson, Henry, 202, 204, 209, 211, 213, 218, 223, 224, 296, 299, 300, 304
Peale, Caroline (Girard) Haslam, Mrs. Franklin, 143, 144
Charles Willson, 114, 350
Franklin, 143
Rembrandt, 114, 198
Peale's Museum, Baltimore, 294
Pearce, James Alfred, 315, 316, 320
Pennington, Lieut. 195
Henry, 206, 210, 216
William, 26
Pennsylvania Chronicle, 49, 50, 58
Pennsylvania Gazette, 287
Pennsylvania Law Review, 353
Perkins, Anne Armour, 238
Judge (John), 333
William H., 150
Perot, A. W., & Co., 136
Perrigny, Mr., 9
Perry, Commodore Oliver Hazard, U. S. N., 181, 204
Peter, Columbia Washington, 142
Grace Dunlop (Ecker), 142
Martha Parke (Custis), Mrs. Thomas, 142
Thomas, 142

Peter Melendy: The Mind and the Soil, by Luella M. Wright, 175
Peters, Rev. Richard, 60-61
Petty, Yates and, 107
Phelps, Mrs. Almira Hart Lincoln, 245
Charles E., 155, 158, 245
Philadelphia Library Company, 8, 12
Philips (Phillips), Capt. Isaac, 207, 211, 216, 217, 309
Samuel, 119
"Philonaus," 8
Picaroons, 351
Pierce, Edward L., 40
Pinkney, Ann Maria (Rodgers), Mrs. William, 281
Ann (Rind), Mrs. Jonathan, 278
Jonathan, 278, 279
Jonathan, Jr., 278
Margaret (Rind), Mrs. Jonathan, 278
Nancy, 278
Ninian, 278, 280, 292
Rev. William, 278 *ff.*, 291
William, 277-292
Pitcher, Molly, 273
Pitt, William, 279
Pittsburgh Gazette, 316
Pizarro, Jose Antonio, 132, 133
The Plain People of the Confederacy, by Bell Irvin Wiley, *reviewed*, 91
Plater, Charlotte Matilda (Edmondson), Mrs. John Rousby, 142, 144
George, 142, 287
John Rousby, 142, 314
Pleasants, J. Hall, 4, 137
Pleasants, J. Hall, *Four Late Eighteenth Century Anglo-American Landscape Painters*, reviewed, 349-351
Pleasants, J. Hall, editor, *Archives of Maryland, LIX*, reviewed, 168-169
Plesanton, Caroline (Dugan), 146
Poe, David, 104
Edgar Allan, 21
Neilson, 21
Political Magazine, London, 66, 68 *ff.*
Politics in Maryland During the Civil War, by Charles Branch Clark, 149-161, 315-332
Poor, Capt. Samuel, 297
Pope, Jennie B., 17
Potts, Richard, 286
Powell, Ann (Kemp), Wilson Register, Mrs. Howell, 339, 340
Howell, 339, 340
Powers, Hiram, 352
Pratt, Adeline (Kent), Mrs. Thomas George, 261
Eleanor (Magruder), Mrs. Thomas, 261
Thomas, 261
Gov. Thomas G., 149, 261
Presbury, Joseph, 213
Preston, Richard, 342, 343
Price, John, 210, 216
Joseph R., 104
William, 317
Proctor, William, 212
The Prohibition Movement in Alabama, 1702 to 1943, by James Benson Sellers, 175
Proud, Robert G., 47
The Providence Oath of Allegiance and its Signers, by Richard LeBaron Bowen, *reviewed*, 92
"Publicola" (pseud. for S. Chase), 281
Purnell, William H., 29, 32
Pyburn, A. M., 176
Ennis, 176

"The Quaker Kemp Farm," 335, 336
Queen Anne's Parish, Prince George's Co., 262
Quebec to Carolina in 1785-1786. Being the Travel Diary . . . of Robert Hunter, Jr., . . . edited by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling, *reviewed*, 355-356

Racing in America, 1665-1865, by John Hervey, *reviewed*, 347-349
Radcliffe, George L., 5, 317
Radoff, Morris L., 277
Rafinesque, C[onstantine] S[amuel], *A Life of Travels (Chronica Botanica, Vol. 8, Number 2.)*, reviewed, 271-272
Ramsdell, Charles W., *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, reviewed, 85
Randall, Alexander, 155, 248
James G., 35
Randolph family, 88
Ranger Mosby, by Virgil Carrington Jones, *reviewed*, 269-270
Ratcliffe, James, 339
"Ravensworth," Virginia, 332
Rawls, William L., 281
Ray, Mrs., 252
Raymond, Mr., 267
Henry J., 36, 38
W. O., 67
Register, Samuel, 339, 340
Renwick, Rev. Mr., 242
Robert, 150
Republican Party, 26 *ff.*, 149 *ff.*
Revenue, Board of, 53 *ff.*
Revere, Paul, 166
Rhoads, Willard, 125

Richardson, Dr. Charles, 215
Leon B., 44
Richmond, Va., 356
Ridgely, Capt. Charles, 171
Gen. Charles, 295
Charles, of Hampton, 96
Charles, of William, 285
James L., 33
John, of Hampton, 112
(Nicholas G.), MacDonald and, 295
Rigg, Philip, 170
Riley, Elihu S., 279
William, 212
Rind, William, 113, 278
Rinehart, William Henry, 133-134
Ring, David, 173
Risteau, Dr. Thomas C., 249
Ritchie, Albert, 150
Rivers of the Eastern Shore: Seventeen Maryland Rivers, by Hulbert Footner, *reviewed*, 351-352
Robb, W., 116
Roberts, Emerson B., 358
ROBERTS, EMERSON B., *Among the "Meeters at the Bayside,"* 335-344
Robinson, Joseph, 98
Ralph, 276
ROBINSON, RALPH, *Controversy over the Command at Baltimore, in the War of 1812*, 177-198
Robinson, Thomas, 240
Rodenwald, William, 23
Rodgers, John, 282
Commodore John, U. S. N., 181, 188, 190, 198, 221, 223, 299, 300
Eliza (Law), Mrs. Lloyd Nicholas, opp. 141, 142, 144 *ff.*
Lloyd N., 96
Rolson, J. Q. A., 150
Roos, Frank J., Jr., *Writings on Early American Architecture*: . . . , 175
Rose, Judge John Carter, 354
Ross, William, 207, 210, 216
Rouse, Edith (Busey), Mrs. James, 276
Emma M., 276
James, 276
Rowe, John, 94
Rubens, Peter Paul, 352
Rush, Benjamin, 166
(Richard), 185
Rusk, William S., 133
Russel, Miss, 143
Mr. Jonathan, 143
Russell, Alexander, 207, 210, 216
Russum, George M., 33
Rutledge, Anna Wells, 355
P. H., 96
Rutter, Maj. Thomas, 80
Ryan, James, 106, 107

Sabine, Lorenzo, 67
Sackville, Lord, 64
St. Barnabas' Church, Prince George's Co., 262
St. George's River, St. Mary's Co., 78
St. Mary Bourne, Baltimore, 80
St. Mary's College, Baltimore, 127, 128
St. Mary's Manor, 75
Sandford, Capt. Robert, 79, 80
Sargent, Charles S., 73, 77
Sasscer, Mr., 260
Saturday Morning Visiter, Baltimore, 101
Saye, Albert B., *New Viewpoints in Georgia History*, reviewed, 174
Schaffer, Frederick, 203, 215, 220, 223
Scharf, J. T., 10, 23, 26, 29, 102, 111, 176, 183, 285, 290
Schley, Frederick, 29
Schmeckebier, Lawrence, 25, 26
Schouler, James, 160
Schroeder, Henry, 207, 210, 216
Schunck, John, 210, 216
Schwartz, A. I., 202
F. I., 297
Schwartze, Dr., Jr., 300
Scott, Frederick Dent, 176
SCOTT, FREDERICK DENT, S. J., *Letters of Severn Teackle Wallis*, 127-140
Scott, Henrietta Maria (Waring), Mrs. Horatio, 261
Horatio, 261
Capt. John Day, 82
Maj. Gen. Winfield, 196 *ff.*
Sellers, James Benson, *The Prohibition Movement in Alabama*, 175
Semmes, Raphael, 86, 176
SEMMES, RAPHAEL, *Vignettes of Maryland History*: Part I, 95-126
70 Years of St. Matthews Parish, Garrett County Md., by Thekla Fundenberg Weeks, 274
Sharp, Judith, Mrs. Peter, 342, 343
Dr. Peter, 342, 343
Sharpe, Gov. Horatio, 49, 50, 53 *ff.*, 111
Shaw, Albert, *International Bearings of American Policy*, 92
Shaw, John, 314
Shelburne, Lord, 64
Shepherdess (ship), 17
Sherman, Stuart C., 94
SHERMAN, STUART C., *The Library Company of Baltimore, 1795-1854*, 6-24
Sherwood, George W., 100
"Shoal Creek," Dorchester Co., 333

Shoemaker, Floyd C., *Missouri—Day by Day*, 274
Shreve, ——— (Tilghman), Mrs. Thomas, 146
Shriver, J. Alexis, 5, 237, 276
Capt. John, 294
Silliman, Benjamin, 239, 267
Sioussat, Annie (Leakin), 4
Sioussat, St. George L., 277
Smallwood, Gen. William, 81 *ff.*
Smith, Bazil, 210, 216
Dennis A., 123
Captain John, 79
John (Cordwainer), 210, 216
John Spear, 198
Joseph, 223, 297
Maj. Gen. Samuel, 177, 179 *ff.*, 205 *ff.*, 295 *ff.*, 355
Samuel I., 150
Samuel H., 10
Thomas A., 47
William E., 26 *ff.*
& Buchanan, 178
Smythe (Smyth), Dr. (James) 208
Snells Bridge, Patuxent River, 179
Snodgrass, Dr. J. E., 121
Snowden, John, 245
Thomas, Jr., 120
Snyder, John, 203
Social Planning by Frontier Thinkers, by Matthew Page Andrews, 175
Some Addresses—The By-Product of a Federal Judge, by W. Calvin Chesnut, *reviewed*, 353-354
Sopher, Aaron, 351
Southern Magazine, 134
Sparks, Miss, 146
Jared, 118
Sparrow, T., of Annapolis, 93
Thomas, 313-314,
Speck, Frank G., 86
Spence, Capt. (Master-Commandant) Robert Traill, 181, 204
Judge Thomas A., 317
Spencer, Richard H., 279
Sprigg, Richard, Jr., 314
"Springfield," Carroll Co., 242
Spurzheim, Dr., 104
Stansbury, Gen. Tobias, 179, 212, 214
Stanton, Edwin M., 32, 328
Starr, William, 206, 210, 216
Steele, Isaac, 313
Isaac Nevitt, 155
Steiner, Bernard C., 127, 282 *ff.*, 317, 318
Sterett, David, 116
Sterling, William, 222
Sterrett, Maj. William, 82, 83
Steuart, Richard D., 85, 170, 352
Stevens, ———, 163
Dorothy (Preston), Mrs. John, 342, 343
Elizabeth, Mrs. John, 337, 340
Elizabeth (Johns) Troth, Mrs. John, of William, Jr., 343, 344
Elizabeth (Alcock), Mrs. John, of Wm. Jr., 343, 344
Elizabeth, Mrs. William III, 343, 344
John, 337, 340
John, of William, 342, 343
John, of John, of William, 343
John, of William Jr., 343, 344
Magdaline, 343, 344
Magdaline Maude, 343, 344
Magdaline (Gary, or Hodges), Mrs. William, 342, 343
Mary, of William, Jr., 343, 344
Mary (Sharp), Mrs. William, Jr., 342, 343
Capt. Richard, 203, 208, 214, 220, 223
Samuel, of William, Jr., 343, 344
Gov. Samuel, Jr., 97, 343, 344
Sarah ———, Mrs. William, Jr., 342, 343, 344
Thaddeus, 326, 327
William, the Immigrant, 342, 343
William, Jr., 342, 343
William III, 343, 344
William, of John, of William, 343
Steward (Stewart), Lt. Col. John, 82
Stewart, Lt. Col. 196
Anthony, 312
John, 338
Joseph J., 33
Robert, 203, 205, 207, 215
Steiner, Bernard C., 1, 25
Stiles, Capt. George, 301, 309
Stodder, Capt. David, 103
Stork, Rev. Levi, 94
Story, Joseph, 280
Stouffer, Henry, 203, 207, 211, 214, 216, 217, 221, 301
Strachey, William, 79
Strauss, Edward M., Jr., 270
Strible, John, 150
Stricker, Brig. Gen. John, 181, 194 *ff.*, 201, 204, 214
Stringfellow, Rev. Horace, 265, 266
Stuart, Gulielmi G., 94
Gen. J. E. B., 269
Julia (Calvert), Mrs. Richard Henry, opposite 141, 145
Sulivane, Dr. James B., 332
Dr. Vans M., 332
The Sullivan Expedition of 1779. Contemporary Newspaper Comment and

Letters, by Albert Hazen Wright, 274
Sully, Thomas, opposite 141
Summers, John, 275
Mary (———), Mrs. John, 275
Sumner, Charles, 39, 318
Sumwalt, Baltzer, 94
Gloria Ann (Linn), Mrs. Baltzer, 94
The Sun, Baltimore, 27, 29, 30, 88, 151, 153, 154, 156, 158 *ff.*, 316, 317, 319, 323
Swan & Iglehart's City Hotel, Annapolis, 247
Swann, Thomas, 32, 46, 47, 154, 155, 157
Syester, Andrew K., 156, 158
Sykes, James, 241
Sykesville, 267

Talbot, Jesse, 126
Taney, Roger Brooke, 13, 107, 133
Tasher, Lucy, L., 27
Tayloe, Benjamin Ogle, 313
Col. John, 146
Virginia, 146
Taylor, James, 203, 208
Dr. James M., 106, 120
Dr. Milton N., 150
Thomas, 344
William, W., 97, 207, 211, 212, 216, 221, 223, 304
Tenant, Maj. Thomas, 301, 302
Third Haven Meeting, 335
This is Carlisle: A History of a Pennsylvania Town, by Milton Embick Flower and Lenore Embick Flower, *reviewed*, 273
Thomas, Mrs. Douglas, 238
Edward L., 33
Francis, 155, 158, 315, 319, 321, 322, 325, 329, 331
Isaiah, 19
James Walter, 75
John Allen, 314
P. F., 105
Thompson, George F., 150
Henry, 96
John P., 100
Through the Years at the Eastern High School, by a Committee of the Faculty, *reviewed*, 173-174
Thruston, Col. Charles Mynn, 163
THRUSTON, ROSALIE (GANNT), MRS. CHARLES BUCKNER, *An Account of the John Brown Raid*, 162-163
Tiernan, Luke, 212
Tierney, John J., S. J., 270
Tilghman, Charles A., 105
Henrietta Maria (Kerr) Mrs. Tench, 146, 147
Jacobus (i. e., James), 311
Matthew, 53, 54
Col. Oswald, 146
Tench, 97
Col. Tench, 82
Gen. Tench, 146
William, 62, 63, 70
Tilton, Josephine (Harwood), Mrs. Edward G., 247, 248, 253
Theodore, 152
Toleration Act, 1649, 117
Townsend, Joseph, 212, 295, 299
Towson Town, 112
Trader, Arthur C., 77
Trapnell, Rev. Joseph, Jr., 259-260, 262
Trimble, Isaac, 104
William, 212
Trinity Episcopal Church, St. Mary's City, 76
Troth, William, 339
Truitt, Ralph V., 170
Trumbull, John, 292
Jonathan, 283
Lyman, 318
Tuck, Margaret Sprigg Bowie (Chew), Mrs. William Hallam, 262
William Hallam, 262
Turner, Mary Ellis, *Karen Long, Medical Technician*, 274
Turner, Samuel, 106
Dr. William, 215
Tuska, Benjamin, 25
Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Bon Secours Hospital, Baltimore, Maryland, 1919-1944, 274
Tyler, Dr. Grafton, 264
Tyson, Elisha, 212
Jesse, 104
Judge John S., 245
Rachel (Snowden), Mrs. John S., 245

Uhler, John E., 20
Unconditional Union Party, 149, 319
Union Republican Party, 157
Upper Marlborough, 259

Van Bibber, Alice, 237
Thomas, 238
Dr. W. Chew, 237
VAN BIBBER, ISAAC, *A Maryland Tour of 1844: Diary of Isaac Van Bibber*, 237-268
Van Bibber, Washington, 237
Van Ness, Maj. Gen., 184
Van Sweringen, Garrett, 77

Van Wyck, W., 116
Vickers, George, 149, 156
Vigilance and Safety, Baltimore Committee of, 181, 199-224, 293-309
VIGNETTES OF MARYLAND HISTORY: PART I, by Raphael Semmes, 95-126
Vorhees, Mrs. Captain, 252
Vosburg, W. S., 347
Votes and Proceedings, Maryland Assembly, 283

Wade, Benjamin F., 32, 36, 328
Wallace, Charles C., 354
Walley, Commodore Zedekiah, 351
Wallis, Elizabeth, 132
  Elizabeth (Teackle), Mrs. Philip, 127
  Philip, 127
  Samuel, 128
  Severn Teackle, 127-140
Walters, William T., 133, 134
Warfield, George Frazer, 241, 243
  Susanna, 243
  William Henry, 243
Waring, Col. Henry, 261
Warner, George, 203, 207, 209, 211, 216, 221, 299
Warren, Charles, 39
  J. Lester, Lord de Tably, 310
Washington, George, 62, 66, 282, 349, 350, 355
  Lewis, 163
Washington, S. Lee, *The Early History of the Stricklands of Sizergh*, 93
Washington College, Chestertown, 107
Washington Hose Company 110
Washington Hotel, Baltimore, 121
Waters, Mrs., 256
  Hezekiah, 203, 211, 215, 221, 304
  Levin L., 159
Watson, John F., 141
Watts, Capt. Joseph, 207, 210, 216
Weary, Thomas, 206, 210, 216
Weaver, William H., 122
Webb, Edmund, 336, 341, 342
  Edmund, Jr., 342
  Elizabeth, Mrs. Edmund, 336, 341, 342
  Mary, 342
  Sarah, 342
  William, 342
  Sarah (Stevens), 343, 344
  William, Jr., 342
" Webley," 341
Webster, Edwin H., 46, 47
  Col. Edwin Hanson, 135, 155, 158, 315, 318, 321, 322, 325 *ff.*
  Capt. John A., 198
Weeks, Thekla Fundenberg, 70 *Years of St. Matthews Parish, Garrett County, Md.*, 274
Weisel, Daniel, 155
Welch, Benjamin, 100
Welles, Gideon, 32, 39 *ff.*
Wells, Thomas, 275
Wertenbaker, Thomas J., 67
Weslager, C. A., *Delaware's Forgotten Folk*, reviewed, 86
Western Continent, Baltimore, 101
We-sorts, 86
Wethered, Levin, 212
Whaland, Joseph, 351
Wheaton, Henry, 280, 291, 292
Wheeler, Joseph Towne, 67, 109, 278, 310
White, Albert S., 326
  John C. & Sons, 305
White Plains, Battle of, 81, 82
Whitfield, Abp. James, 104
Whitman, William, 239, 241
Whitney, Henry C., 28
Whittingham, Bp. William Rollinson, 238, 239
Whyte, Joseph, 280
  William Pinckney, 138 *ff.*, 281
Wildes, Harry Emerson, 142 *ff.*
Wiley, Bell Irvin, *The Plain People of the Confederacy*, reviewed, 91
Wilkinson, Maj. Gen. James, 196
Willard, Miss, 264
WILLIAM PINKNEY'S FIRST PUBLIC SERVICE, by Max P. Allen, 277-292
Williams, Mr. 10
  America Pinckney (Peter), Mrs. William George, 142
  C., 83, 84
  Elizabeth, 338
  Ennion, 338
  Henry, 133
  Mary, 338
  Rachel, 338
  Roger, 92
  T. Harry, 34
  William, 338
  William E., 100
Willie, David, 223
Wilson, Mr., 257
  Charles R., 38
  Eleanor (Kemp), Mrs. William, 339, 340
  H. W., 42
  James, 201, 202, 208, 209, 273, 306
  James, J. P., 203
  James G., 201
  Rev. Joseph P., 118
  Robert, 216
  William, 199, 202, 211, 220, 224, 293, 301

William, 339, 340
William Bowly, 201
Winder, Lt. Col. Levin, 82, 83
Gov. Levin, 180 *ff.*
Brig. Gen. William Henry, 177 *ff.*, 298 *ff.*
Winslow, Rev. Dr. Gordon, 247, 249, 253
Winstanley, William, 350
Wirt, William, 128
Wish, Harvey, *George Fitzhugh, Propagandist of the Old South*, reviewed, 175
Wiss, Dr. George E., 30
Wittman, Talbot Co., 335
Woelpert, George, 203, 207, 209, 211, 216, 217, 304
Wolstenholme, Daniel, 51, 52
Wood, Joseph, opposite 177
Lindsay Lomax, 87
Thomas W., 355
William, 96
Wooddy, William, 98
Woods, Mrs. William, 295
Woodworth, Samuel, 20
Woolery, Jacob, 120
Woolford, Dr. Arthur, 94
Grace, Mrs. James, 343
James, 343
"Woolf's Harbour," 336
Worthington, Brice John, 252
George, 246
Dr. Hattersly P., 246
Wright, Albert Hazen, *The Sullivan Expedition of 1779. Contemporary Newspaper Comment and Letters*, 274
Wright, Hendrick B., 176
Wright, Louis B., and Tinling, Marion, editors, *Quebec to Carolina in 1785-1786, Being the Travel Diary . . . of Robert Hunter, Jr.*, . . . , reviewed, 355-356
Wright, Luella M., *Peter Melendy: The Mind and the Soil*, 175
Wright Capt. Samuel Turbott, 83
Silas, 176
Writings on Early American Architecture: An Annotated List of Books and Articles on Architecture Constructed before 1860 in the Eastern Half of the United States, by Frank J. Roos, Jr., 175
Wrightson, Elinor (Blake), Mrs. Francis, 338, 340
Francis, 338, 340
Rebecca (Kemp), Mrs. William, 339, 340
William, 339, 340
Wroth, Lawrence C., 109, 270

Yates & Petty, 107
Yoacomico Indians, 74, 78
Young, Hugh H., 170

Zenger, Peter, 270

9873